The Force Awakens: Japan's Constitutional Revision in Context

Olivia Griffin
B.A., Plan II Honors, Government, and History
The University of Texas at Austin
Spring 2018

Dr. Patricia Maclachlan
Department of Government and Asian Studies
Supervising Professor

Dr. Terrence Chapman
Department of Government
Second Reader

ABSTRACT

Author: Olivia Griffin

Title: “The Force Awakens: Japan’s Constitutional Revision in Context”

Supervisor: Dr. Patricia Maclachlan

Japan is at a historic crossroads in its politics and foreign policy. After more than a half century of constitutionally imposed pacifism, Japan’s Prime Minister, Abe Shinzo, is seeking to revise the postwar constitution, and, more specifically, Article IX. Article IX states that Japan “aspires to peace” and is prohibited from using offensive military forces and maintaining “war potential” for the purposes of settling international disputes. Yet in recent years, Japan has adopted a broader definition of Article IX, permitting the use of Japanese forces in UN peacekeeping forces, the Coast Guard, and in collective self-defense. With Prime Minister Abe’s re-election in October 2017, Japan now appears poised to revise the constitution and formally embark on a new era in its foreign policy as a “normal power” with an unrestricted military force.

This thesis examines the causes and significance of the Japanese government’s recent prioritization of constitutional revision. While Japan’s foreign policy shifts can be partly attributed to a plethora of new security threats in the world such as the rise of China and the North Korean nuclear program, the debate over constitutional revision has existed for decades. This thesis examines the transformation of Article IX from a taboo topic to entering the mainstream political discourse. Furthermore, it argues that constitutional revision is a process driven by domestic politics rather than simple realist responses to international threats.

This thesis will examine primary and secondary literature to analyze the trends of discourse surrounding Article IX from its inception to the present and better understand how it transitioned between stigmatized and normalized. It will begin by examining the origins of the American-drafted constitution in the wake of World War II, the initial debate over the constitution in the 1950s, and the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis. Next, it will examine the taboo nature of Article IX revision from the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis through the first term of Abe. Finally, it will analyze the shifts in Article IX interpretation under postwar Japan's most nationalistic prime minister, Abe Shinzo.

This thesis hopes to understand the current constitutional debate in Japan by examining the broader context of the debate over constitutional revision in Japan. To understand Abe's push for revision, we must look back at history to understand the origins of this debate and the recurrent themes, then fast-forward to the present where these insights will be applied to the current policy debates over Article IX.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my incredible advisors - Dr. Patricia Maclachlan and Dr. Terrence Chapman of the Government Department of the University of Texas at Austin. Their direction, assistance, and wisdom were critical in completing this project, and I am so lucky to have such excellent professors who have gone out of their way to help with this project.

To my interviewees who helped bring this research to life: Noboru Yamaguchi, Traci Hoopingarten, and Michael Bosack of the International University of Japan, Narushige Michishita of the Graduate Institute for Policy Studies in Tokyo, and Kenneth McElwain of the University of Tokyo.

To my family and friends – thank you to my mother, who joined me on my research trip to Japan! Thank you also to my family in Japan, Jan Oppie and Zo Hamada, for their incredible hospitality.

To the Plan II Honors program for challenging me to write a thesis, and for providing a grant to help fund my trip to Japan.

Table of Contents

“Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

“In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.”

- Article IX of the Japanese Constitution

List of Abbreviations

ASEAN - Association of Southeast Asian Nations
DPJ - Democratic Party of Japan
DPRK - Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea)
JCG - Japanese Coast Guard
LDP - Liberal Democratic Party
NDPO - National Defense Program Outline
OECD - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PRC - People's Republic of China (mainland China)
ROC - Republic of China (Taiwan)
ROK - Republic of Korea (South Korea)
SDF - Self-Defense Forces (Japan's military)
UNSC - United Nations Security Council

Introduction:
Japan's New Normal

Japanese Prime Minister Abe Shinzo had won the vote of the public in a landslide in the October 22, 2017 snap election. The conservative prime minister from a family of prominent politicians, Abe was now on track to become Japan's longest-serving prime minister. Yet the results of the election went beyond Abe's unprecedented success. The election gave Abe the public support necessary to move forward with his long-standing ambition to revise the postwar constitution and expand the capabilities of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. Now that Abe had been re-elected and his Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) held a two-thirds majority in the lower house, he had the rare conditions necessary to move forward with the process of revising Article IX of the postwar constitution:

> "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes. In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be maintained."

Abe's plan to revise the constitution entails adding a third clause to the aforementioned paragraph that codifies the existence of the Self-Defense Forces. While this amendment appears innocuous, it is a politically controversial proposal that reflects decades of the issue wavering in and out of the political mainstream.

In a picture taken on October 18, 2017, a man holds a leaflet supporting Abe and the LDP. (Behrouz Mehri - Getty Images)

The push to amend Article IX represents a larger trend in Japanese defense strategy. Today, Japan stands at "the threshold of a new era."[1] After decades of pursuing a passive, middle-power role in global defense and foreign affairs, Japan is gradually shifting away from its past norms and institutions to embrace a more active role in global security. Post-Cold War Japan has increased its participation in UN Peacekeeping Operations, humanitarian aid projects during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, expanded the use of its Coast Guard to function as a pseudo-navy, and twice upgraded its military ties with the U.S. In September 2015, Japan took its most daring and controversial step yet when it passed legislation that reinterpreted Article IX to allow for "collective self-defense." This interpretation permits the Japanese Self-Defense

[1] Pyle

Forces to come to the aid of their allies such as the U.S. and South Korea should they ever fall under attack. With this shifts, Japan is moving toward becoming a "normal power" whose military might is commensurate with its impressive status as the world's third-largest economy. It is important to note that the present interpretation of the constitution does not prevent Japan from attacking itself should it be attacked first by another state such as North Korea. Since it was first drafted, Japan has maintained the right of self-defense as outlined in Article 51 of the UN Treaty. While Article IX prevents Japan from launching an offensive attack against another country, it does not prevent Japan from fighting back against a belligerent.

The debate over Article IX existed long before threats such as the rise of China and the North Korean nuclear program. As early as 1952, the political scientist Theodore McNelly commented that "two of the leading questions in Japanese politics are how much Japan should rearm, and whether that rearmament requires a change to the Constitution."[2] Yet the debates over constitutional revision all but disappeared after the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, when a massive outcry emerged after Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke revised the terms of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty.

From 1960 to 2007, Article IX had been a taboo topic. During this time, legislators worked around Article IX rather than attempting to revise it. Yet under Abe, constitutional revision re-entered the mainstream discourse and suddenly became a priority issue on the government's agenda. This thesis examines the factors that brought about this new attitude towards constitutional revision. In particular, it looks closely at how the push to revise the

[2] McNelly

constitution is a byproduct of domestic politics rather than a response to security threats such as China and North Korea.

Changes to the international security environment have aided to a small degree in bringing about the normalization of Article IX in Japanese politics. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, a plethora of new threats, including the economic and military rise of China and the North Korean nuclear program, threaten Japan's security and stability in the East Asia region. Furthermore, the changing dynamic of the U.S.-Japan alliance further compels Japan to adopt a more robust defense policy. At the end of the Cold War, the original rationale for the U.S.-Japan alliance – defense against and containment of the Soviet Union – vanished. Today, Japan fears abandonment by the U.S., and the U.S. is increasingly expecting Japan to shoulder more of its defensive burden. For example, during the 2016 presidential campaign, then-Republican nominee Donald Trump criticized the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, saying that while the U.S. is required to come to the defense of Japan, the Japanese can "sit at home and watch Sony television."[3] While Trump's statement reflects a shallow understanding of the complex U.S.-Japan alliance and undermines Japan's contributions to the partnership, it does legitimize the fears of abandonment in the eyes of many Japanese.

Yet prior to Abe, Japanese politicians would have worked around Article IX to address these threats. Abe, on the other hand, has already passed a reinterpretation of the constitution and is pushing forward to revise the constitution for the first time since its creation. Furthermore, external threats have always existed, and cannot singlehandedly explain Japan's sudden shift to revise the constitution. This begs the question: why is constitutional revision now suddenly a

[3] *Japan Times* - August 6, 2016

hot-button issue in Japanese politics? Several factors within the domestic political system have played critical roles in galvanizing the debate over constitutional revision. Many scholars pinpoint Japan's recent security expansion to a combination of new security issues, the individual leadership of Abe, and rising nationalism in Japan.[4] The leadership of various figures in postwar Japanese history has also played a critical role in both stigmatizing and normalizing constitutional revision. Yet no leader has been as influential as Abe Shinzo in bringing about such a rapid shift in attitudes towards Article IX. Abe is postwar Japan's most nationalistic prime minister to date, and has placed constitutional revision at the forefront of his policy agenda. This is the first time that any leader in postwar Japanese history has been bold enough to actively and openly pursue constitutional revision.

This thesis examines the transformation of Article IX from a taboo subject to a priority, hot-button issue in Japanese politics. It examines the factors that brought Article IX from the fringes of radical discourse into the mainstream of Japanese politics. Furthermore, it steps back to examine the debate over constitutional revision in the broader context of Japanese history to demonstrate that the debates over Article IX are not a new phenomenon nor are strictly attributable to external threats such as the rise of China or the North Korean threat. This thesis instead examines the ideology behind constitutional revision, and how domestic political discourse has shifted to allow for Article IX revision to enter the mainstream.

Foreign policy is, at its core, the study of how ideas and debates eventually become policy.[5] This is no better exemplified than in the ideologically-driven debate regarding Japanese foreign policy, where constitutional revision is as much the byproduct of decades of intellectual

[4] Oros
[5] Milne

discourse as it is a simple realist response to new security threats. At its core, the story of Japan's constitutional revision is the story of how an idea became a platform of a major politician and may become a policy, and how a previously stigmatized subject might transform into a priority policy agenda.

Placing the process of Japanese constitutional revision in the simple realm of realist international relations theory without examining the broader shifts in normalized discourse occurring is not only an incomplete view, but is also far less interesting. The debate over Japan's constitutional revision does not neatly fit into the traditional realist theory of international relations, because under realist assumptions, Japan would be apt to revise its constitution to meet the new threats of the North Korean missile program and the economic and military rise of China. Yet Japan even in the face of these threats, Japan demonstrates a marked reluctance to revise its constitution, restrained by nearly half of voters that would vote against Article IX. This thesis seeks to understand how Japan's constitutional revision transcends realist international relations theory. In a sense, Japan's possible constitutional revision is the product of domestic politics rather than a response to international threats.

This thesis begins by examining the history of Article IX from the occupation at the end of World War II until the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis. It will examine the origins of the constitution, including the American role in drafting it and how these events factor into present-day discussions about revision. It analyzes the factors that permitted discussions about constitutional revision to be discussed without any taboo during this time. The third chapter examines how Article IX revision was quickly stigmatized following the end of the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, and how it remained that way until the Abe administration. It focuses on

how politicians addressed security threats by working around Article IX, rather than addressing its revision outright. Chapter 4 examines how discussions about Article IX revision became acceptable under Abe, and examines the factors that led to the normalization of Article IX in Japanese politics. The thesis concludes by examining scenarios for Japan's constitutional revision, and what a revision might mean for the future of Japanese defense policy and U.S.-Japan relations. While it is too soon to state with certainty which path Japan will take, this thesis will examine how constitutional revision has gone from mainstream to stigmatized to normalized again, and will examine the factors that allowed this to occur.

Chapter Two:

The History of Article IX from the Occupation to the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis

Constitutions are always born at major turning points in history.[6] Whether the result of a revolution, the introduction of a colonial power, or the overthrow of a dynasty, no constitution has ever been created during a "normal" time in history. The Japanese constitution is no exception. The postwar Japanese constitution and Article IX emerged at one of the most critical junctures in Japanese history. To understand the context of Article IX and some of the hostility towards it today, it is critical to understand this watershed moment in history. When its constitution was drafted, Japan, which had once been one of the mightiest military powers in the world, was vanquished and occupied by a foreign nation. A complete reform of Japanese politics from areas ranging from land use to corporate policy to the military ensued under the American occupation. Along with this came Article IX, the brainchild of General Douglas MacArthur.

From its creation to the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, Article IX did not carry the stigma that it would from 1960 to 2007. Yet once the Security Treaty Crisis ended, Article IX became a taboo subject almost overnight, and would not re-emerge into the mainstream for nearly fifty years. What factors caused this sudden shift in discourse? Furthermore, why did the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis – which focused primarily on the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, not Article IX – have such an impact on the stigmatization of Article IX revision?

---

[6] Shoichi

This chapter analyzes the factors that allowed Article IX to be openly discussed prior to 1960. It examines how the origins of Article IX, Japan's relationship with the U.S. during the 1950s, nationalism, and domestic politics came together to influence the debate over Article IX. This chapter argues that the context of Japanese politics during the 1950s allowed for the issue of Article IX revision to avoid stigma, and that the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis marked a major shift in the acceptance of an acceptable, mainstream topic of political discourse.

All of these factors point towards the ideologies of Article IX revision being primarily influenced by domestic political factors rather than external threats. Much like how domestic political factors brought Article IX back into the mainstream under Abe, domestic issues – including public opinion, nationalism, and individual leadership – played a critical role in bringing Article IX revision to the forefront around the time of the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, then suddenly into obscurity once the crisis had resolved.

The Origins of Article IX

The controversial origins of and American role in drafting Article IX played a central role in sparking opposition to the constitution during the 1950s. To this day, the origins of the constitution remain a point of frustration for some of those who oppose the constitution. Article IX first appeared in the wake of World War II. To many opponents of the constitution, the circumstances surrounding the constitution are perceived as a humiliating and undemocratic, and feel that the constitution was forced upon Japan by an alien nation.[7]

[7] Dower

An allied correspondent stands in the radioactive rubble in front of what was previously an exhibition hall in Hiroshima, Japan. (AP - Stanley Troutman)

"Japan, paying for her desperate throw of the dice at Pearl Harbor, passed from the ranks of the major powers at 9:05 a.m. today," wrote a correspondent for the *New York Herald Tribune* on August 15, 1945. World War II left Japan's people starving, cities decimated, and economy in shambles. Reports emerged of extreme starvation and desperation, with tens of thousands of orphans and widows left behind to fend for themselves.

As Kenneth Pyle writes, "in order to survive, Japan had been forced to adopt an alien civilization."[8] The dire suffering that many Japanese faced after World War II played an

[8] Pyle p. 148

important role in influencing their later pacifist beliefs.[9] While the American Occupation was not an ideal situation for the Japanese, the people and government accepted it in hopes that it might bring a better future for Japan. The current status quo certainly could not be much worse. The cooperation with the U.S. helped Japan to survive: the Americans provided critical food aid that kept millions of Japanese from starvation.

Led by General Douglas MacArthur, the American occupation of Japan was effectively a military dictatorship and ruled over Japan with an iron fist.[10] Other nations from the victorious World War II alliance chose to distance themselves from the occupation of Japan. The Soviet Union refused to place troops under the command of General MacArthur, while Chiang Kai-shek, the Nationalist leader of the Republic of China, was preoccupied in his doomed fight against the Communists in northern China that had been raging since the 1930s. Britain and France were still in shambles following the catastrophic damage of the war in Europe. That left the United States on its own to manage the reconstruction of Japan.

While the Americans claimed to advocate for liberal values such as women's enfranchisement, labor unionization, and universal education, in reality, the occupying forces prohibited Japanese citizens from traveling abroad, abolished the Shinto religion, and imposed heavy censorship. Japan's occupation and the development of its constitution and new government were anomalous in several regards. Japan is one of the only nations in history in which democracy was forced upon it rather than earned through revolution.[11] The American occupation of Japan was the first time in history in which an advanced nation intervened in another country to force democratic institutions upon it and correct from within the ills of its

[9] Reischauer
[10] Dower
[11] Gordon

society.[12] Even more anomalous about the forced democracy in Japan is that it worked. As demonstrated in nations such as Iran, Guatemala, and Iraq, American-backed, forced democracy tends to have an extremely low success rate, making the development of Japan's political institutions all the more fascinating. The fact that the government has not only stayed intact, but that the constitution remains unamended to this day is a puzzling phenomenon.

The American occupation of Japan differed from the occupation of Germany in several ways. These differences would have an importance in the policies of drafting the new constitution and establishing a new government. To begin with, the German occupation was divided into four distinct zones of occupation administered by the Americans, Soviets, British, and French.

Complete demilitarization: Japanese soldiers surrender their rifles as a Soviet soldier looks on.

(Yevgeny Khaldei, Library of Congress)

[12] Reischauer

Meanwhile, the Japanese occupation was single handedly carried out by the Americans. Additionally, the attitudes towards the Japanese and the Germans by the American occupation forces differed significantly. While Nazism was perceived as a disease that the Germans needed to be cured from and as a distinct phenomenon from German politics, the Japanese imperial quest was seen as an intrinsic character flaw in the Japanese nation.[13] To some degree, the American attitudes were motivated by race.[14] The Japanese people were perceived as an exotic, non-white, non-Christian beast to be tamed, while the Germans were a wayward brother to be cured. As such, the American strategy of reconstructing Japan focused on completely rebuilding its political institutions and developing a constitution that de-fanged its military. While there was certainly a strategic motivation in the development of Article IX, it is important to note that Germany never faced such a rigid, codified demilitarization. Furthermore, the contradiction between the post-war reconstruction of Germany and Japan add further controversy to the origins of Article IX that adds fuel to the voice of Japan's most ardent nationalists.

In some regards, opponent's complaints about the legitimacy of Article IX are valid. MacArthur's insistence on pushing through his draft of the constitution did not reflect the interests of most policymakers in Washington. The U.S. leaders actually desired active Japanese participation in drafting the constitution and made no explicit demands for the permanent demilitarization of Japan.[15] MacArthur ignored his advisers in Washington, going ahead with the new constitution and Japan's codified demilitarization.[16] To his credit, MacArthur did attempt to

[13] Dower
[14] Dower
[15] Bertofsky
[16] McNelly

involve a few Japanese citizens in drafting the constitution. However, Japanese participation was primarily limited to the most elite inner circle of society.

In the midst of the questionable involvement of those involved in drafting the constitution, the public remained under heavy censorship imposed by the American occupation forces. If the Japanese were fortunate enough to find out about the new constitution and had any opposition to its terms, they were unable to do anything about it: criticisms of the American leadership were strictly prohibited during the Occupation.[17] With a dearth of information and lacking the right of free expression, mainstream Japanese involvement in drafting the constitution was effectively nonexistent. The context of the constitution's origin leaves a complex legacy in the eyes of many Japanese. To critics, it was drafted in undemocratic and unjust conditions. This origin played a central role in fueling the argument against Article IX during the 1950s. To many who advocated for the revision of Article IX, it is not about the function of the constitution, but rather what it represents.

While the origins of the constitution would not change after the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, the U.S.-Japan relationship would adapt to be more egalitarian and attempt to right some of the wrongs in the initial draft of the constitution. While frustrations about the origins of the constitution remain today, they do not play an essential role in calling for a revision of the constitution. Despite the questionable origins of the constitution, many would find it to be good enough following 1960. However, this view had yet to catch on during the 1950s, making the American based origins of the constitution and Japan's alliance with its former enemy a major point of contention in security politics.

---

[17] Shoichi, Dover

Regardless of the opinions surrounding Article IX, Japan was also in no position to revamp its military. Rather, it focused on ensuring strong economic growth, which could be assisted by Article IX. Rather than seek power through imperial conquests, Japan now sought power through economic prowess. This economic prioritization would pay off in a few years with Japan's "economic miracle." However, this attitude created further division amongst the Japanese on the issue of Article IX revision, and would ultimately come to assist in making Article IX taboo in the future.

A New Alliance

In the days leading up to the end of the American occupation in April 1952, the *Nihon Yukan* newspaper wrote the following haiku:

"Cherry trees have blossomed out.

We will be independent soon.

Why don't we feel as happy as we should?"

While the Americans would be withdrawing from their official occupation of Japan, they retained an important role in Japan, leaving U.S. forces on bases in Okinawa and establishing the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between Japan and the U.S. mere hours after the Occupation was officially ended at the 1952 San Francisco Peace Conference. The U.S.-Japan Security Treaty has set the tone for defense cooperation between Japan and the U.S. to this day. The guidelines strove to "strengthen the bonds of peace and friendship traditionally existing between them," and stipulated that the U.S. would come to the defense of Japan in the event of an attack. Meanwhile, the Americans were permitted to base their troops on Japanese territory, including the island of Okinawa. These guidelines were drafted in the context of the rising Cold War, in which the U.S. sought to contain the spread of communism and protect itself and its allies from Soviet influence by establishing a security treaty with Japan.

However, the U.S.-Japan security cooperation was not without controversy. Throughout the 1950s, the U.S.-Japan alliance was a contested subject in Japan. A 1953 survey of the Japanese public indicated that 35 percent of Japanese favored "an alliance with the free world," while 38 percent preferred "neutrality."[18] A miniscule percentage preferred an alliance with the Communist bloc. A September 1959 survey by the *Yomiuri Shinbun* indicated that 50 percent of Japanese preferred neutrality, while a mere 26 percent favored siding with the U.S. and the free

[18] Packard

world.[19] These conflicts of opinion over Japan's alliance with the U.S. would continue to grow until they reached a peak and sparked the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis.

During this time, even the U.S. government remained torn on the issue of Article IX. As mentioned earlier, MacArthur's decision to constitutionally demilitarize Japan was not reflective of the desires of policymakers in Washington to begin with. By 1953, then-Vice President Richard Nixon admitted that the U.S. leaders had come to believe that Article IX and the demilitarization of Japan were a mistake. On a 1950 visit to Tokyo to renegotiate the peace treaty, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles urged Japan to rearm. With tensions escalating in Asia, Japan had the potential to be a valuable ally to the United States as a military force. Despite these initiatives, the American suggestions to revise the constitution were met with a surprising source of opposition: the Japanese people. While there was still a desire to revise Article IX expressed in the political mainstream, a sizable portion of the Japanese public had quickly come to support Article IX.

[19] Packard

MacArthur and Hirohito meet at the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo to discuss the post-war settlement (Getty Images)

Despite this support, Article IX revision remained an openly discussed issue throughout the 1950s. Japan's testy alliance with the U.S. no doubt played a role in prompting this push. Many Japanese viewed the alliance with the U.S. as a unfavorable relationship either in violation of the peace clause of Article IX or as a hindrance of Japan's autonomy. The relationship with the U.S. undoubtedly aggravated the views of many of Japan's nationalists. Prior to the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, the terms of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty were highly unequal and unfair to the Japanese, sparking the anger of many nationalists. This anger spilled over into the

call for the revision of Article IX, which symbolized the authority of the Americans over the Japanese.

Public Opinion During the 1950s

During the 1950s, public opinion on constitutional revision was fairly evenly split, mirroring the public attitudes about constitutional revision today. Japan's new political system and place in the world following World War II launched it into an identity crisis regarding its defense politics. Compared to prewar Japan, postwar Japan was extremely divided on security and political issues. Article IX remained a particular point of contention. While many Japanese opposed Article IX, others unflinchingly clung onto it. These supporters of Article IX reflected on the consequences of World War II and hoped for Japan to never again suffer the damages that it had during the war. Both sides of the debate were equally passionate about their stance on the issue, which would result in a major political standoff by the end of the decade. As the political scientist Andrew Oros writes, "there has never been a domestic consensus on Japan's appropriate role in the international system."[20] Even from the early days, Article IX remained vigorously contested.

Within Japan, the elite discourse surrounding defense policy and Article IX revision divided into two ideological camps: the pragmatic conservatives led by Yoshida Shigeru, and the anti-mainstream revisionists led by Hatoyama Ichiro and Kishi Nobusuke. The pragmatic conservatives argued for a closer alliance with the U.S. and upholding Article IX as the basis for Japan's peace and prosperity. Meanwhile, the anti-mainstream revisionists called for the revision

[20] Oros

of Article IX and Japan's increased independence from its American allies. The conservatives longed to revoke Article IX and restore sovereignty to the emperor. While Hirohito maintained his imperial role following World War II, his power was greatly lessened, aggravating the sentiments of many nationalists in Japan.

Nationalism played a major role in spurring the desire for constitutional revision in the anti-mainstream revisionist camp. Nationalism can be notoriously difficult to define. However, in broad terms, nationalism in Japan correlates with the belief that Japan should have a preeminent role on the global stage: whether in its military forces, at the United Nations, or in the global economy. However, nationalism can take many forms, and expressions of nationalism in Japan have differed throughout time. Expressions of nationalist sentiment also changed from the pre-1960 era to the post-1960 era. Today, Japanese nationalism can be reflected in an array of institutions and symbols in a country ranging from displays of its flags to support for sports teams to beliefs on political issues. Japanese nationalism is loosely similar to the nationalistic attitudes in former British colonies that propelled their political push for decolonization. This nationalism is fundamentally a desire for sovereignty, whether that be independence from a colonial power or greater autonomy over one's foreign and defense policy stances.

One of the most prominent advocates for revision, Kishi, was the first postwar prime minister to be embraced by Japan's extreme nationalists, and had expressed nationalist ideologies for decades. As will be discussed later in this chapter, rising levels of nationalism played an important role in bringing about the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis. Nationalism and calls for the revision of Article IX are often correlated with one another: Kishi himself espoused many nationalistic views and called for the revision of Article IX frequently. While it is impossible to

definitively determine if there is a causal relationship between Article IX revision and nationalism, there is certainly a correlation between the two factors.

Japanese nationalism is a complex phenomenon that dates back decades. Historians trace the origin of Japanese nationalism to the Tokugawa shogunate, the dynasty that ruled from 1600 to 1868, but add that it emerged in its modern conception during the Meiji Restoration from 1868 to 1912.[21] During the Meiji Restoration, a number of events occurred that solidified the strength of Japanese nationalism. Japan's victories in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) inspired "huge outpourings of nationalist pride."[22] Japan's victory over Russia in particular sparked a rise in nationalism after Japan became the first non-Western nation to defeat a Western superpower in the contemporary era. This nationalistic pride was maintained in the years leading up to World War II. The intellectual historian Maruyama Masao describes Japan's imperial endeavors during the first half of the twentieth century as being motivated by nationalism and an ideological viewpoint that transformed morality into power.[23] Japanese imperialism was driven by both realist strategic concerns and nationalist ideologies. Japan colonized nations for access to raw resources that it would otherwise not have access to on its limited land space. Yet many historians also argue that Japanese imperialism was driven by nationalist ideologies. Kenneth Pyle notes that Japanese nationalism was driven by "a preoccupation with strategic advantage and a peculiar combination of nationalist ambition and insecurity."[24] While public opinion data for this period is lacking, most historians argue that the mainstream of intellectual and popular voices in Japan during the

[21] Matthews
[22] Matthews
[23] Maruyama
[24] Pyle

interwar period supported the notion of a Japanese empire on the basis of national pride rather than or in addition to realist strategic concerns.

The ideologies of nationalism did not immediately disappear at the end of World War II. While the American occupation made deliberate attempts to eliminate nationalism in Japan, it would continue into the 1950s and be expressed in the push for Article IX revision and independence from the U.S. hegemony. These nationalist ideologies would continue to grow until the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, when they would reach a boiling point. Yet after the Security Treaty Crisis, these voices would be pushed away to the fringes of discourse, to be discussed only by the most radical members of Japanese society.

1960 Security Treaty Crisis

The climax of this division took place during the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis. In this event, the issues of domestic politics and public opinion, the U.S.-Japan alliance, and nationalist sentiments came together to prompt a watershed moment in Japanese politics. The Security Treaty Crisis is often regarded as the most important political event since the end of the Occupation. It marked a reversal in the discourse around security politics, quickly pushing Article IX revision into the fringes of radicalism.

Prior to the revision of the Security Treaty, both pacifist-leaning socialists and militaristically inclined nationalists vehemently opposed the treaty. The nationalists believed that the treaty was too restrictive for a respectable nation like Japan, while the socialists believed that the treaty violated Article IX and introduced war potential to Japanese soil. According to a July 1959 poll from the *Tokyo Shinbun*, 44.5 percent of respondents believed that the treaty with the

U.S. was likely to involve Japan in war, while only 21.5 percent of respondents believed that the treaty enhanced Japan's security.[25] Only 10.8 percent of respondents favored revising the new treaty, and the rest favored a revision or were undecided.[26]

A new, revised Security Treaty was signed on January 19, 1960 at the White House by President Dwight Eisenhower and Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke. The new treaty made significant changes to the U.S.-Japan alliance, and, in theory, benefited Japan. The new treaty deleted the clause permitting the U.S. forces to intervene in large-scale riots and disturbances atthe request of the Japanese government and eliminated the requirement for Japan to receive prior consent from the U.S. for granting military rights to any third party.

Striving for closer relations: President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke play a round of golf in 1957. (Associated Press)

[25] Packard
[26] Packard

To celebrate what appeared at the time to be improved U.S.-Japan relations, Eisenhower and Crown Prince Akihito agreed to exchange official visits later that year.

While this appeared to be a diplomatic triumph for the two nations, it would quickly deteriorate into a situation that would threaten the very future of U.S.-Japan relations. The 1960 Security Treaty Crisis would vehemently oppose the new terms of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, though it would never change the terms of the treaty itself. Furthermore, it would call into question almost every aspect of Japan's security policy, including Article IX itself. At the time, Article IX was still a fairly normalized subject of discussion in Japan, and would not bear the taboo that it would carry in later years. Naturally, it managed to find itself in the discussions and protests that would occur during the Security Treaty Crisis.

According to historian George Packard, two factors precipitated the Security Treaty Crisis: the "resurgence of Japanese nationalism" and "discontent with the presence of U.S. troops on bases." The discontent with the U.S. troops was fairly straightforward: Japan was frustrated at the continued presence of U.S. troops on bases such as Okinawa, and the Treaty allowed them to remain on the bases indefinitely. Despite the opposition to these bases during the Security Treaty Crisis, U.S. troops remain stationed on Okinawa today.

Meanwhile, the issue of nationalism proves a more enigmatic factor. By 1960, a new nationalism had emerged in Japan. With that new nationalism came the desire for Japan to play a larger role in world affairs and disentangle itself from its alliance with the U.S. Packard writes that "1960 was the year that the very subject of nationalism, long suppressed as an evil associated with the militarists, emerged again as a respectable topic of conversation."

With the re-emergence of nationalism came the increased debate over Article IX revision.

Article IX revision has long been associated with nationalist ideologies, which have partly contributed to why it is such a taboo subject. Nationalism entered into a taboo following World War II, where it was associated with the militaristic excesses that led to the destruction of the Pacific theater. Following World War II, nationalism disappeared along with the imperial government. Yet when nationalism quickly became a more acceptable topic of conversation in the prelude to the Security Treaty Crisis, talk of Article IX revision also seeped into the national discourse. In many regards, Article IX entered the discourse during the Security Treaty Crisis not simply because of the Security Treaty itself, but in large part due to the normalization of nationalism that occurred during this time and subsequently allowed Article IX revision to be discussed without stigma.

This rise in nationalism was undoubtedly affected by the ascendance of Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke. Kishi had unexpectedly succeeded the previous prime minister, Ishibashi Tanzan, after Ishibashi had succumbed to an illness after less than a month in office. Kishi is regarded by historians as one of Japan's most nationalistic politicians and responsible for galvanizing significant nationalist support for the revision of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and Article IX. Born in 1896 in Yamaguchi Prefecture to a former samurai family, Kishi would go on to be a part of one of Japan's most influential political dynasties. After studying under the ultra-nationalistic professor Uesugi Shinkichi at Tokyo Imperial University from 1917 to 1920, Kishi went on to co-sign the declaration of war against the U.S. in 1941. Kishi would serve several influential roles in the Japanese imperial government during World War II. Following the war, the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal convicted Kishi of Class A war crimes and imprisoned him at Sugamo Prison. Ultimately, the charges against him were dropped before he could stand trial.

Despite his time in prison, Kishi would rise to the office of Prime Minister in less than five years after the war. Kishi "epitomized what progressives feared."[27] Kishi openly championed the cause of Article IX revision and a renegotiation of Japan's relationship with the U.S. In October 1958, Kishi appeared on American television and declared that it was time for Japan to revise Article IX. In his 1983 biography, Kishi elaborated on these assertions, stating that he considered the postwar constitution to be a legacy of the U.S. occupation following World War II. In the spirit of the new nationalism, Kishi proposed seeking closer relations with other Asian nations while distancing Japan from the U.S.

Kishi was the first postwar prime minister to be openly embraced by Japan's most extreme nationalists. The "notably Machiavellian politician"[28] would go on to resign in disgrace in 1960, but not before pushing through a new Security Treaty with the U.S. and sparking the largest protest in Japanese history. Tensions were so high that Kishi was stabbed six times in the leg by a rightist fanatic shortly after his resignation. Despite his fall from grace, Kishi's ideas would continue to influence future pro-revisionist politicians, including his own grandson, the current Prime Minister, Abe Shinzo. While nationalist ideologies disappeared from the mainstream after Kishi left office, these ideas would remain and re-emerge in the next century.

Yet before Kishi would resign, Japan would be thrown into political turmoil. Throughout the spring, public outrage regarding the treaty continued to grow. Much of the anger was expressed in frustrations over Kishi himself. A May 20 editorial from the *Asahi Shinbun* wrote that the LDP's mainstream had placed a great strain on Japan's parliamentary democracy, and called on Kishi to "reflect" on his acts. The next day, the same newspaper published an editorial

[27] Reischauer
[28] Pyle

calling on Kishi to resign. The public shared an equally frustrated attitude about Kishi. Between April 1959 and June 1960, approximately 960,000 protesters had staged 223 demonstrations Tokyo. These protesters chanted demands including "Dissolve the Diet," "Down with the Treaty," and "Overthrow Kishi." Intellectuals also played a pivotal role in stoking public sentiment against the treaty.

Protesters also voiced their objections to President Eisenhower's visit that had been scheduled to occur in June 1960. Eisenhower was to be the first sitting American president to visit Japan, and the visit was supposed to be a positive note in U.S.-Japan relations. Eisenhower's decision to also visit the Philippines, Taiwan, and South Korea on the same trip further irritated the Japanese public. The press had began publishing reports cautioning against Eisenhower's visit, and the U.S. government ultimately agreed with the assessment of the press, canceling Eisenhower's trip to Japan.

The demonstrators frequently gathered in front of the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo, at one point swarming the car of an embassy official on his way out. Many of the chants specifically targeted Eisenhower's visit, causing concern over what the reaction would be should the American government follow through with the visit. The protests in Tokyo were filled with recurring motifs such as "*Aiku no Honichi o Soshi Seyo!*" ("Stop Ike's visit to Japan!") and "*Ampo no Joyaku o Funsai Seyo!*" ("Smash the Security Treaty!"). Eisenhower's visit was called off. A U.S. president would not visit Japan until Gerald Ford visited in 1974, two years after Richard Nixon made his historic visit to China.

Protesters from Shizuoka Prefecture join demonstrations in Tokyo, June 11, 1960. (AP)

Despite these frustrations with American officials at large, there was a surprising lack of anti-Americanism expressed in the protests. Packard notes that "American reporters and tourists mingled freely among demonstrators, and one American student even participated in the demo." [29] This lack of anti-Americanism boils lends credence to the belief that the protests were not against the Americans per se, but rather demanding greater Japanese sovereignty in the realm of international affairs and a more egalitarian relationship to the U.S. Furthermore, the reaction to the security treaty was not a reaction to the international political system but rather a domestic political phenomenon directed at their own leader and not the U.S. Hence why the conflict vanished almost immediately following Kishi's resignation.

[29] Packard

The 1960 Security Treaty Crisis resolved on the morning of June 23, 1960, when a dejected and exhausted Kishi announced his intention to resign as Prime Minister. Upon Kishi's resignation, the public attitude "switched from outrage to apathy."[30] Discussions over Article IX revision were immediately silenced after the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, and did not re-enter the mainstream political discourse until Abe took office in 2006. Nationalism re-entered its stigmatization after briefly entering the mainstream discourse surrounding the Security Treaty Crisis. Article IX revision would not be discussed again by mainstream politicians until Abe's administration in 2007.

The Aftermath of the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis: Impacts on Article IX

The 1960 Security Treaty Crisis provides an example of how discussions over Article IX revision enter into the mainstream of Japanese political discourse. These discussions are largely reflective of domestic political struggles rather than international context. For example, frustration with the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty was brought about by domestic political issues. From a realist perspective, the Japanese should have quickly embraced the Security Treaty as an effective means of ensuring the global balance of power and protecting Japan's interests at home and abroad. Yet despite these practical, realist concerns, Japan did not embrace the treaty.

Discussions over Article IX revision would both disappear into silence after 1960 and re-emerge in 2007 due to similar domestic political factors. While certain external factors always play a role in security discussions in Japan, as they did in the 1960 crisis, they are not sufficient for bringing about the issue. Rather, domestic politics pave the way for further discussions on

[30] Packard

security issues. Furthermore, the chaos of 1960 provided the Japanese people with a clear example of what happened when security politics and political dissention got out of hand. Revising Article IX provided a clear risk of returning to the chaos of 1960, prompting a quick quieting of any discussion. The status quo was now satisfactory: Kishi had resigned, and Japan had a fairly egalitarian relationship with the U.S. Japan's current situation was good enough, and not dire enough to necessitate major political controversy by calling for a revision of Article IX. Revising Article IX was not worth having the former Prime Minister being stabbed six times in the leg.

A radical shift occurred after 1960, when the Japanese public clung to Article IX and legislators worked around Article IX rather than attempt to revise it. After 1960, any suggestion of revising Article IX would have been considered highly inappropriate. But why the sudden shift? As will be demonstrated in the next chapter, several factors will contribute to Article IX's stigmatization following the chaos of 1960.

Chapter Three

The Post-1960 Taboo: Growth Within Article IX

The 1960 Security Treaty Crisis brought an abrupt end to the mainstream political debate over Article IX revision. As opposed to the hotly contested "push-and-pull" dynamic of politics during the 1950s, the post-1960 era brought about a normalization of security politics in Japan.[31] While politicians and voters continued to debate defense and security policy, they tended to avoid hot-button issues such as Article IX and developed a consensus around the philosophies of Yoshida Shigeru, which called for a reliance on the U.S.-Japan alliance, prioritization of economic growth, and maintenance of Article IX.

This chapter examines the factors that contributed to this sudden shift in discourse, including shifts in the U.S.-Japan alliance, changes in public opinion, and the role of individual leadership, and how these shifts were subsequently represented in the discourse over issues such as space policy and nuclear weapons.

Several factors would contribute to the Japanese public and politicians commitment to Article IX during this era. One of the main reasons was that Japan strove to avoid the catastrophic consequences of the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis. Japan had barely made it through the crisis at the time, and did not want to risk chaos in its growing economy and political system for a constitutional revision that would realistically not make a major impact on Japan's security.

[31] Oros

Other factors included an improved relationship with the U.S., a growing taboo surrounding nationalistic ideologies, and a prioritization of economic growth.

With the normalization of security politics came a shift in the overall discourse surrounding Japanese defense policy. Since 1960, most of Japan's leaders have based their grand strategies on the philosophy of Yoshida Shigeru, known as the "Yoshida Doctrine." The Yoshida Doctrine prioritized building a strong domestic economy and maintaining the U.S.-Japan alliance. More importantly, the Yoshida Doctrine also promoted the maintenance of Article IX in its established form. From the end of the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis to the first administration of Prime Minister Abe Shinzo in 2007, Japanese leaders worked within the terms and precedents of Article IX rather than attempting to revise it. A common misconception about Japanese security policy during this time is that Japan avoided serious debates over its security policy after the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis until the end of the Cold War.[32] Though talk of Article IX revision had become taboo, debates over security policy continued in Japan. During this era, politicians and the public deliberated over issues such as space policy, the use of nuclear weapons, and the alliance with the U.S. The outcome of these debates would reflect increased public support for Article IX and a pacifist defense policy. Japanese defense capabilities underwent considerable changes during this time, but all modifications fell within the scope of Article IX.

1960s Defense Debates

Two key political debates in the 1960s serve as examples of how Article IX's provisions were embraced by the public and politicians. These debates included the use of space for military

[32] Oros

and defense purposes as well as the use of nuclear weapons. In both of these debates, the general public opinion among the Japanese reflected an acceptance of Article IX. The Japanese hesitated from any policy that might deviate from the terms of new constitution, indicating their growing acceptance of Article IX.

The first debate involved the use of space. Andrew Oros writes that "Japan's space policy stands out from other world space powers due to the nearly complete separation of space policy from military planning."[33] Japan's atypical practices regarding the use of space were codified in a 1969 Diet resolution affirming a commitment to the absence of military forces in space. The public's reactions to space policy are indicative of attitudes towards Article IX. While Article IX itself stirred controversy less than ten years earlier, by the 1960s, Japan had expressed outrage about deviating from Article IX by introducing "war potential" to space. For example, the Japanese public and mass media erupted into a fervor when they learned that an American U-2 plane had been launched from above Japan and was subsequently shot down by the Soviet Union.[34] This outrage came not from the anger at the defeat of their the U.S., but at what they believed to be a violation of Article IX by the Americans. The shifting ideologies of the Japanese public surrounding Article IX are reflected in the discussions that occurred surrounding space policy in the 1960s.

Japan's debates over space-use policy were "deeply rooted in ideational convictions over the appropriate role of Japan's military establishment in the domestic political debate and policy tenet of antimilitarism."[35] In the midst of the UN discussions on the peaceful use of space in the 1960s, the Japanese framed this concept as the 'nonmilitary' use of space, while the Soviets and

---

[33] Oros
[34] Oros
[35] Oros

Americans perceived it to be simply the 'nonaggressive' use of space. The Japanese attitudes in these debates reflect a greater embrace of the tenets of Article IX than in previous years. Contrary to just ten years prior when Article IX was hotly contested among the Japanese, the Japanese in the 1960s made a point to uphold Article IX in their space policies. While space policy is a small cross section of Japanese defense policy during this time, the attitudes towards space are a reflection of the general avoidance of the subject of Article IX revision among the public.

The debates over nuclear policy in the 1960s also reflected public acceptance of Article IX. While some of the elite discourse was ambivalent about the use of nuclear weapons, the public remained adamantly against it. Politicians during this era ultimately shunned the use of nuclear weapons to appease public opinion. For example, in 1964 Prime Minister Sato said that Japanese needed nuclear weapons to keep up with its communist neighbors following a Chinese nuclear test. But, he conceded, the nuclearization of Japan would never happen because "the majority of Japanese were dead set against the possession of nuclear weapons."[36] Thus, to appease public opinion, Sato developed the "Three Non-Nuclear Principles"[37] that were eventually codified into law via a formal Diet resolution. Despite his personal convictions, Sato adhered to the 1954 interpretation of Article IX which stated that Japan could possess only "the minimum necessary force"[38] required for self-defense. The adoption of an anti-nuclear policy in the 1960s represents the convergence of public and elite attitudes on defense policy to reflect a more pacifist stance and acceptance of Article IX. The more uniform discourse over nuclear

[36] Kenneth Pyle
[37] The Three Non-Nuclear Principles are a parliamentary resolution that were never officially adopted into law but nevertheless play an important role in regulating Japan's nuclear policy. The tenets state that "Japan shall neither possess nor manufacture nuclear weapons, nor shall it permit their introduction into Japanese territory."
[38] Fundamental Concepts of National Defense, Ministry of Defense, www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/d_policy/dp01.html

weapons reflected the general trend at large, when views on Article IX revision became to be homogenized and contrarians began to become more silent in the debate over defense.

Post-1960 U.S.-Japan Relations

After the conclusion of the Security Treaty Crisis, the U.S.-Japan relationship became less of a point of contention among the Japanese. Generally, American policymakers attempted to make the relationship more egalitarian, and Japan began to see the U.S. in a more positive light. The public image of the U.S. in Japan is critical to understanding the shifting Japanese attitudes towards constitutional revision. Because the constitution was written almost entirely by the U.S. occupation forces, anti-American sentiment and opposition to the postwar constitution are often intertwined. Many of the demands for constitutional revision during the 1950s emerged from the anti-American sentiment associated with the origins of the constitution. The improved relations with the U.S. during the 1960s quieted many of these frustrations, because while the controversial origins of the constitution remained, the sense that Japan was a lesser partner to the U.S. was significantly decreased. This further lessened the demand for constitutional revision, particularly among the more nationalistic Kishi-acolytes that had prioritized the issue.

One of the factors that influenced this shift in U.S.-Japan relations was the shift in leadership after the 1960 crisis. A few months after the crisis, the charismatic and youthful John F. Kennedy would win the 1960 presidential election. Kennedy's administration brought a new direction to U.S.-Japan relations. In June 1961, Kennedy would meet with Prime Minister Ikeda to launch a new era of "equal partnership." Kennedy sent the renowned Japan expert and

Harvard professor Edwin Reischauer to serve as his ambassador to Japan. Reischauer, who had a deep understanding of Japanese history and culture, quickly earned the respect of the Japanese people. The Kennedy allure proved effective in easing anti-U.S. attitudes that might have otherwise been opposed to the American-imposed constitution and demilitarization. Reischauer writes that "Kennedy enjoyed extraordinary popularity in Japan, particularly among the young people and progressives who were more likely to be anti-American, thus softening opposition to the American relationship."[39] Had Richard Nixon, the aloof former Vice President of Dwight Eisenhower, been in power at that critical time instead, the course of U.S.-Japan relations following the Security Treaty Crisis might have taken a different direction, perhaps even increasing anti-American sentiment that could in turn have led to demands for constitutional revision. Kennedy, who had fought against the Japanese naval forces during World War II, began

[39] Reischauer

Bobby Kennedy greets guests at Waseda University. (LIFE Magazine)

Despite continuing challenges during the 1960s such as left-wing opposition to the U.S. actions in Vietnam and frustrations with the "Nixon shocks"[40] during the 1970s, the U.S. and Japan pursued an improved, more egalitarian relationship following the Kennedy administration. The United States continued to encourage Japan to play a larger role in international affairs. In 1964, to the frustration of its European allies, the United States insisted on Japan's admission to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).[41] Surveys in the 1960s indicated that a greater percentage of the Japanese public supported Japan's relationship with the United States than before the new Security Treaty was signed in 1960. Yet despite this improvement, the percentage of the public in favor of the alliance remained at around half the population.

The increased cooperation between the U.S. and Japan was codified in the 1978 Defense Cooperation Guidelines. Per these guidelines, Japan would be postured against the Soviet Union in a "sword and shield" strategy. This approach used Japan's 2400 kilometer long archipelago to shield against Soviet access to the greater Pacific Ocean. The 1978 defense guidelines stipulated that the JSDF and the U.S. forces "will undertake necessary joint exercises and training when appropriate" and "will develop and maintain intelligence necessary for the defense of Japan."[42] In the event of an armed attack, "Japan by itself will repel limited, small-scale aggression. When

[40] The "Nixon shocks" were a series of economic measures undertaken in 1971, such as removing the U.S. dollar from the gold standard, that negatively impacted Japan.
[41] Some European nations hoped to keep the OECD as a club of Western nations. Japan, on the other hand, was the first non-Western nation in the OECD, with the exception of Turkey.
[42] 1978 U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation Guidelines

it is difficult to repel aggression alone due to the scale, type, and other factors of aggression, Japan will repel it with the cooperation of the United States."[43]

However, the provisions of the 1978 Defense Guidelines were constructed within the existing terms of Article IX. Moreover, the 1978 Defense Guidelines allowed Japan to continue pursuing its pacifist course by outsourcing certain defense and intelligence capabilities to the U.S. Furthermore, the 1978 Defense Guidelines signified that the U.S. did not expect Japan to carry a significant burden of defense in the Asia-Pacific region as it would in the post-Cold War era. Because of these guidelines, a revision of Article IX would not create a significant change in Japanese defense policy. Rather, a revision would be a time-consuming and politically risky endeavor with few tangible benefits for Japan's security. These conditions were important in silencing demands for Article IX revision during the post-1960 era, because they made the political costs of revision outweigh the potential benefits of doing so. While advocating for Article IX revision is risky for any politician at any time period, spearheading a constitutional revision would have been a needlessly reckless political endeavor. Essentially, the improved relationship and close defensive ties with the U.S. brought about a further silencing of discussions about Article IX revision. Revising the constitution was simply not worth the political hassle involved in orchestrating revision. However, as will be explained in later chapters, as the U.S.-Japan relationship shifted in the post-Cold War era, the benefits of constitutional revision began to increase significantly as new threats emerged and the U.S. demanded greater Japanese cooperation in shouldering its defensive burden.

[43] 1978 U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation Guidelines

The 1980s: Japan Becomes a Major Power

By the 1980s, the debates over Article IX were pushed even further away from the mainstream in part due to Japan's prosperous new status quo. As opposed to the decimated and occupied nation in the wake of World War II, by the 1980s Japan had the second-highest GDP in the world, inspiring both awe and anxiety in its rivals. To that point, economic prosperity and prowess on the global stage had silenced the complaints of extreme nationalists, further pushing Article IX revision to the backburner. Japan had charted an unprecedented position in which its military might was not commensurate with its economic prowess, yet it had earned itself a spot as one of the world's pre-eminent nations. By this point, it appeared that perhaps a major military force would not be necessary to transform Japan back into a major global power. Subsequently, Article IX revision was further silenced.

The 1980s presented Japan with a new era of possibilities and opportunities. Reischauer noted that "the late eighties and early nineties may be a key moment in history, opening great

possibilities for Japan if it is ready."[44] While the U.S. expressed frustrations about its trade imbalance with Japan, economic relations between Japan and the U.S. were closer than ever. Although the Cold War was at its peak, Japan itself faced few external threats, and its economy was booming.

During this time, Japan underwent some shifts to its defense policy, but continued to work within the terms of Article IX rather than attempting to revise it outright. One leader who was particularly influential in bringing about these shifts was Nakasone Yasuhiro, the long-time critic of the Yoshida Doctrine[45] and Prime Minister from 1982 to 1987. Nakasone "made a bold and ambitious attempt to reorient Japanese national purpose and to define a new and broader national interest,"[46] controversially instituting a 5 to 7 percent increase in defense spending. While these shifts violated unofficial policies such as the one percent cap on defense spending, these practices did not violate any real law. Nakasone's spending increases also barely rose above the one percent cap. Regardless, it still prompted an outrage from the Japanese public, and the proposed increases in defense spending were promptly abandoned. Japan would maintain these defense spending caps until a series of increases in defense spending that occurred in the Abe administration. If a violation of an unofficial policy sparked such an outrage in Japan, attempting to revise the constitution would cause an unimaginable uproar.

The world order quickly and unexpectedly shifted at the outset of the 1990s. Changes such as the fall of the Berlin Wall, the burst of Japan's 'economic bubble,' and the growth of the North Korean nuclear program all played a role in the ongoing debate about Article IX revision.

---

[44] Reischauer

[45] The Yoshida Doctrine was the pacifist guidelines for foreign policy that most of the post-1960 Japanese prime ministers followed to the end of the Cold War. Tenets included reliance on the U.S. military alliance, prioritization of economic growth.

[46] Kenneth Pyle

As will be demonstrated in the next chapter, these shifts in the international system would bring a renewed debate over Japan's defense policy and Article IX. Some proponents of revision believed that the new world order necessitated a stronger, more robust military. However, revision of Article IX would not gain traction in the mainstream political discourse during the 1990s. While legislators would expand the role of the SDF and Japanese defense capabilities, no major politician would go as far as to suggest an outright revision of Article IX until Prime Minister Abe Shinzo took office in 2006. Various factors, such as the shifts in the U.S.-Japan relationship, the ability of Japan to expand its Self-Defense Forces without violating the constitution, and public opinion during the time would play an important role in postponing Article IX revision until Abe's first term as Prime Minister.

Chapter 4:

Post-Cold War Years

Japanese defense policy rapidly pivoted at the end of the Cold War, yet serious discussion about constitutional revision remained absent from the political discourse. The changing international conditions at the end of the Cold War brought about shifts in Japan's security strategy, but these changes continued to follow the trend of working around Article IX rather than attempting to revise it outright.

For a few years, Japan's security strategy faced an uncertain future. The threats that defined Japan's security strategy up to that point had vanished. The U.S.-Japan alliance was also in flux: with the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, the original rationale for the U.S.-Japan alliance disappeared overnight. Japan's basic defense policy (*kokubo no kihon hoshin*), written in 1957, had been oriented around the Soviet threat, with Japanese ships, planes, and tanks configured to repel a Soviet invasion from the north.[47] Suddenly, policymakers were forced to redefine the aims of Japanese defense policy. One might have expected revisionist voices to emerge during this security vacuum to claim a more assertive foreign policy that was not constrained by Article IX. Yet the more militarist and radical groups did not emerge to try to take control over Japan's foreign policy and push for Article IX revision.

After a few years of debating its security identity, new security threats emerged that

[47] Samuels

helped to quickly re-define Japan's defense strategy. The first and most urgent dilemma that Japan faced was North Korea. The North Korean threat had been on Japan's radar since at least the 1970s. Up to that point, however, the most significant threat had been the then-rumored abduction of Japanese nationals from Japanese territory by North Korean operatives. With the growth of its nuclear program in the 1990s, North Korea became a more urgent issue for Japan. In August 1998, North Korea launched the Taepodong missile over the island of Honshu in northern Japan. Japan immediately mobilized to discuss this threat, though outright revision of the constitution remained out of the question. A week after this missile launch, the government and the LDP began to look into the possibility of acquiring multipurpose satellites to be used for Japan's defense. Two months later, the cabinet decided to launch four "information gathering" and intelligence satellites. While these moves contradicted the precedents for space policy set forth in the 1960s and broadened the interpretation of Article IX, they did not nullify or revise any portion of Article IX. At that point, it was not necessary to address the security threat.

By the early 2000s, North Korea had been solidified as Japan's most existential and absolute security threat. Richard Samuels wrote at the time that "for historical and ideological reasons, relations between Japan and North Korea today are the most contentious and mutually distrustful of any in the world."[48] The heightened North Korean threat also prompted Japan to engage its Self-Defense Forces for the first time since World War II. In December 2001, a North Korean spy ship disguised as a fishing boat fired upon a Japanese ship. In response, the Japanese navy fired back. Though atypical, this incident still remained within the military's right of self-defense and did not violate Article IX. This incident demonstrated that addressing the North

[48] Samuels

Korean threat and ensuring the protection of Japan could still occur within the provisions of Article IX. Japan still maintained every right to fire back at North Korea, as long as North Korea shot first.

The incident with the North Korean spy ship became a catalyst for the expansion of the Japanese Coast Guard. As a civilian agency, the JCG is not subject to the terms of Article IX and therefore possesses more discretion in deploying both offensive and defensive force. During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the Japanese government invested more money in the JCG and gradually expanded its role to serve as a pseudo-navy force. The expansion of the JCG serves as another example of how the Japanese government responded to new threats after the end of the Cold War without needing to revise Article IX. Rather than expand the use of force by the SDF to address these provocations by the North Koreans, the Japanese government exploited a legal loophole to permit the JCG to gradually become a more assertive force in the defense of Japan against these new threats.

During this time, the international community endeavored to address the North Korean threat through diplomatic, rather than military, efforts. With the initial focus on non-military strategies to address North Korea, the Japanese had little reason to push for Article IX revision. Rather, Japan joined China, the United States, Russia, North Korea, and South Korea in the Six-Party Talks from 2003 to 2007. The Six-Party Talks were a series of diplomatic summits aimed at curtailing North Korea's nuclear program. For a brief period, these approaches seemed viable, so at that time, an argument to revise Article IX to address the North Korean threat would have appeared naively uninformed and recklessly militaristic. As mentioned earlier, the JCG also possessed the ability to defend against North Korean aggressions at sea, limiting the need for the

SDF to play a role in defending against North Korea. Additionally, the Japanese Coast Guard possessed the ability to defend against North Korean aggressions at sea, limiting the need for the SDF to play a role in defending against North Korea.

The second rising threat facing Japan was the economic and military rise of China. China was first formally mentioned as a threat to Japan in the 2004 defense guidelines.[49] Never before have China and Japan been great powers at the same time, presenting an unprecedented situation with an uncertain future. Some expressed legitimate concerns that this power struggle could result in the outbreak of war. The younger generations in China, particularly those born after the Tiananmen incident, were appearing to be even more anti-Japanese than their predecessors.[50] For example, the Chinese organized a number of anti-Japanese demonstrations at the 2004 Asia Cup soccer match. The anti-Japanese attitudes in China play key roles in debates over Article IX revision. First, it discourages politicians from seeking constitutional revision because of the potential backlash in China should an amendment be pursued. Many in China view Japan's attempts to revise the constitution as a sign of its renewed belligerency in the Asia-Pacific region and perceive it to be a threat to Chinese interests. On the other hand, the anti-Japanese attitudes in China also motivate some Japanese to press for constitutional revision out of the need to stand up to potential Chinese aggression. China's quick economic and military growth combined with deep historical resentment of the Japanese make many in Japan nervous about the potential threats emerging from China. Some argue that a more robust military beyond the constraints of Article IX are essential in addressing this new Chinese threat.

---

[49] Samuels
[50] Samuels

Yet the chances of Japan and China engaging in military conflict were, and continue to be, slim. As China's economy grew, economic relations between China and Japan grew closer as well. While the Chinese and Japanese expressed frustrations about their respective neighbors, those sentiments did not outweigh the many benefits of cooperation between the two nations. Instead, they continue a complicated yet functional relationship. With the probability of conflict between Japan and China relatively low, Japan had no urgent need to revise its constitution, at least in the context of addressing the looming China threat.

1990s: Legislators Work Around Article IX

Several critical moments in the post-Cold War era prompted an expansion of Japanese defense capabilities. However, these expansions were crafted as means to work around the terms of Article IX rather than a rebuttal of the constitution. Japan's leaders analyzed and debated how to expand the scope of its Self-Defense Forces after the "paradigm shift"[51] at the end of the Cold War, yet still adhered to Article IX. While the debates addressed a gamut of issues relating to security policy, mainstream debates never went as far as to suggest a revision of Article IX. Rather, the preservation of Article IX was the priority. Policymakers simply worked around the existing terms. Furthermore, policymakers reinterpreted Article IX to better suit the needs of the era. For example, the Diet reinterpreted Article IX to allow for the deployment of the SDF in the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq for humanitarian purposes, Japanese participation in UN peacekeeping operations, and financial assistance to the U.S.-led coalition in the First Gulf War.

[51] Yamaguchi

However, despite their political and military significance, these were still reinterpretations of Article IX rather than outright revisions.

Japan broadened its engagement in the new world order in the First Gulf War (1990-91): but this was not enough to satisfy its allies. Rather than sending troops to assist in the international coalition against Saddam Hussein, Japan instead sent $13 billion in aid. Due to the constraints of Article IX, Japan was prohibited from sending its troops abroad to serve in the Gulf War. Japan's involvement in the First Gulf War was subjected to extensive debate in the Diet: a major concern was that Japan's involvement in transporting or purchasing weapons violated the "war potential" clause of Article IX.[52] This debate in the Diet represents how Article IX was often reinterpreted or analyzed within its existing terms rather than revised to suit the needs of the present geopolitical situation. The ultimate decision to uphold the pre-existing terms of Article IX rather than revise the constitution to meet the demands of the Gulf War reflects the greater trends of the 1990s: Japanese legislators avoided the politically risky task of revising Article IX and instead chose to uphold the terms of Article IX.

This "checkbook diplomacy" left the U.S. and Japan's other allies outraged. When the Kuwaiti government thanked the rest of the coalition for its assistance, it blatantly refused to acknowledge Japan's financial contribution.[53] This outrage prompted Japan to pursue a bigger role in security operations, though it pledged to remain within the constraints of Article IX. In 1992, the Diet passed the Peacekeeping Operations Law after extended debate and controversy in the Diet and among the public.[54] This law permitted Japan to deploy troops for humanitarian and post-conflict reconstruction purposes. When the international community mobilized to wage the

[52] Yamaguchi
[53] Samuels
[54] Yamaguchi

"war on terror" after the 9/11 attacks, Japan did not again make the mistake of sitting on the sidelines. In October 2001, a new law was passed to dispatch the Self-Defense Forces to assist in the U.S.-led strikes in Afghanistan and Iraq. This marked the first overseas deployment of Japanese troops since the end of World War II.[55] This deployment proved to be extremely controversial among the Japanese. Before the troops were deployed, the government had to convince the public that there would be no actual combat operations or violation of Article IX.[56] Yet the use of force by Japanese troops was still heavily regulated within the constraints of Article IX. During the Iraq War, the Japanese troops were only permitted to be deployed to Samawah, a medium-sized village in southern Iraq that had been deemed a "non-combat zone." The troops focused on tasks such as civil engineering and building public facilities such as hospitals, roads, and water treatment facilities. These troops were limited in their ability to defend themselves. When local insurgents launched an attack, the Japanese troops had to be defended by the Dutch and Australian troops.[57] Essentially, the international outrage following the lack of Japanese involvement in the First Gulf War prompted Japan to reorient its defense policy. However, it did not bring about a call for revision of Article IX.

During the 1990s, the Japanese government continued to expand the role of the SDF by working around Article IX, yet suggestions for Article IX revision failed to gain traction among either the Diet or the public. The 1994 National Defense Program Outline (NDPO) are a perfect example of this trend. The NDPO upgraded the U.S.-Japan alliance in the event of a regional

[55] Osius
[56] Yamaguchi
[57] Samuels

crisis and added disaster relief and peacekeeping operations to the SDF portfolio, enabling the Japanese to play a greater role in global affairs.[58]

In short, the reason why constitutional revision never occurred in response to the new security threats of the 1990s is because policymakers were able to find ways to address the new defense threats without revising Article IX. Through strategic reinterpretations and efforts to expand the Japan's defensive role within the present constraints of Article IX, Japan managed to rise to the needs of the post-Cold War era without needing to revise its constitution.

Koizumi: Reform, But Not Revision

Japan's defense policy further expanded under the administration of Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro from 2001 to 2006, yet no major push for constitutional revision came about during this time. Koizumi, a "colorful and determined reformer,"[59] came at a defining moment in history. Shortly after his election, Koizumi convened the Japanese legislature's Research Commission on the Constitution to reconsider the rules of force in regards to Article IX. This action makes it apparent that while Koizumi was not attempting to revise the constitution, he was certainly attempting to reinterpret it. Just four months into Koizumi's administration, the world was rocked by the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Following these attacks, Koizumi agreed to support the U.S.-led "war on terror," contradicting the previous "checkbook diplomacy" and hesitant Japanese defense policy during the 1990s.

Yet public opinion during the Koizumi administration generally favored more pacifist stances. According to a 2004 SAGE poll, 47.7 percent of Japanese viewed war as illegitimate

[58] Samuels
[59] Pyle

even if one's own state is attacked, and only 21.5 percent believed that a strong defense would result in peace.[60] Japanese views on the role of the military and international cooperation contrasted greatly with those of the U.S.: 85.9 percent of Japanese believed that a war could be avoided through international cooperation, while only 41.9 percent of Americans held this view. [61] Koizumi expanded the military by deploying troops for humanitarian purposes to Iraq and Afghanistan. However, while Koizumi's proposals were unprecedented, they did not violate the terms of Article IX. Furthermore, Koizumi made it clear that Japan would avoid military actions. In a 2001 visit to Yasukuni Shrine, Koizumi declared that "Japan should never again walk on the path to war."[62] Koizumi simultaneously expanded the Japanese defense forces and strove to alleviate historical tensions with Japan's neighbors. On a visit to Beijing in October 2001, Koizumi apologized to the Chinese victims of Japanese aggression. These statements were partly intended to appease public opinion both in Japan and abroad. The government's expansion of defense capabilities stoked domestic and foreign anxieties about Japanese remilitarization, and Koizumi's statements were intended to alleviate these fears and reaffirm Japan's commitment to peace.

In addition to the 2001 bill that allowed the deployment of Japanese troops to assist the U.S.-led strikes in Afghanistan, Koizumi also began to look into new ways to work around the constitution. He convened the legislature's Research Committee on the Constitution shortly after his election to examine and re-evaluate the legal basis for the use of force. Yet this research committee was not designed to push through a revision of the constitution. Rather, in the trend of

[60] Oros
[61] Andrew Oros
[62] Osius

A JSDF member collaborates with a Dutch soldier during the Iraq War. (AP)

how Article IX was approached during this time, it was focused on working around the pre-existing terms of the constitution.

Koizumi's greatest legacy was his willingness to break away from Japan's tradition of passive internationalism and move towards a more robust foreign policy stance. Yet although Koizumi was able to push through with these reforms, the public remained divided in its opinion on the deployment of Self-Defense Forces abroad. By the time the Iraq War came around in 2003, a greater large portion of the public remained skeptical of Japanese involvement in the conflict, even for humanitarian assistance purposes. Public opinion data at the time also supported the constitution as a whole. In 2007, 86.5 percent of Japanese citizens believed that the Constitution had "brought about economic development through lasting peace," and indicated

Japan's SDF collaborate on humanitarian projects in Iraq.

that they were not quite ready to modify their peace constitution.[63] Based on these attitudes, it would have been difficult for Koizumi to push through a referendum on constitutional revision.

Post-Cold War U.S.-Japan Relations

The post-Cold War era brought about a changing dynamic to the U.S.-Japan relationship. With the fall of the Soviet Union, policymakers in the U.S. and Japan debated the future of the alliance. Ultimately, they decided to continue the alliance while simultaneously expecting Japan to shoulder more of the burden in the relationship. Shouldering more of the burden, however, did not translate to a revision of Article IX. Though U.S. leaders in the 1950s such as Richard Nixon and John Foster Dulles suggested that Japan needed to revise its constitution to cooperate more closely with the U.S. on defense, neither the U.S. nor Japan publicly adopted this view in the

[63] Penney and Wakefield

1990s. The debate in Japan focused on how to cooperate with the U.S. forces while subsequently adhering to the orthodoxy of Article IX. The debates did not ask whether Japan should revise Article IX. Rather, the debates asked questions like how the Japanese could cooperate with the U.S. on intelligence gathering while still adhering to the guidelines of Article IX. For example, if Japan provided the U.S. with information that was subsequently used to fire upon a target, would that violate Article IX? While some might have expected that the shift in the U.S.-Japan alliance would have prompted Japan to debate Article IX to maintain its relationship with the U.S., the inverse occurred. Japan instead debated the U.S. alliance to maintain Article IX.

Regardless, the U.S. and Japan had to do something. During the 1980s, Japan's rapid economic growth strained its relationship with the U.S. As Japan appeased U.S. demands for more egalitarian trade policies, its economy began to falter, though its economic bubble burst was not directly related to the U.S. trade policies. Regardless, these economic struggles in the 1980s and 1990s further complicated relations between the U.S. and Japan. Additionally, Japan no longer offered the same strategic benefit to the U.S., prompting some policymakers to consider abandoning the defense alliance.

Protests against U.S. bases on Okinawa, 1995.

Frustrations regarding the U.S. bases reached an unprecedented peak in September 1995 following the brutal rape of a twelve-year-old schoolgirl by three U.S. military personnel. This incident sparked the largest civil protests against the U.S. bases in Japanese history.[64] Long-held frustrations emerged, yet demands to remove Article IX were not heard in the public outcry. This might seem paradoxical given the intricate relationship between Article IX and U.S.-Japan defense cooperation. Japan simply wanted to continue its restrained foreign policy, but in an adjusted relationship with the U.S.

Yet despite, or perhaps as a result of, this outcry, the relationship between the U.S. and Japan was revamped in the late 1990s to promote greater cooperation between the two nations. The most significant upgrade of U.S.-Japan relations during this era was the development of the

[64] Andrew Oros

1997 U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation Guidelines. The new Defense Guidelines stipulated that "Japan will conduct all its actions within the limitations of its Constitution and in accordance with such basic positions as the maintenance of its exclusively defense-oriented policy and its three non-nuclear principles." Regarding Japan's self-defense, the guidelines stated that "Japan will possess defense capability within the scope necessary for self-defense on the basis of the 'National Defense Program Outline.'" The 1997 Defense Guidelines upgraded the ties between Japan and the United States, providing for closer cooperation between the two nations on ensuring security and information-sharing. The new defense guidelines also provided or cooperation in a range of activities beyond information-sharing and defense. Following up on the 1992 Peacekeeping Operations Law, the Defense Guidelines stated that "when either or both Governments participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations or international humanitarian relief operations, the two sides will cooperate for mutual support as necessary." The guidelines also promoted closer cooperation between the U.S. and Japan in transportation, medical services, information sharing, and the education and training of personnel. As Noboru Yamaguchi, a former commanding general in the Ground Self-Defense Forces and key figure on the team that drafted the 1997 Defense Guidelines stated, the new guidelines filled in the gaps from the 1978 guidelines in the current U.S.-Japan defense policies.

Several of the events and security challenges during the 1990s caused the U.S. and Japan to realize that it was time for the two countries to renegotiate the terms of their alliance. The first of these issues was the rising North Korean threat. By 1993, it had become clear that the North Koreans were developing a viable nuclear program, posing a danger to both the United States and Japan. Addressing the nuclear threat required incredibly close cooperation between the

United States and Japan. The 1995 Hanjin earthquake was next in the series of events prompting the new defense guidelines. The Self-Defense Forces had played a critical role in the disaster relief efforts following the earthquake. In the same year, a terrorist attack occurred on the Tokyo Metro. To a country where crime is almost non-existent, these incidents shocked the nation and sparked the realization that something should be changed. Finally, the rape of a twelve-year-old schoolgirl on the island of Okinawa by U.S. marines stationed nearby added to the frustration regarding the U.S.-Japan relationship. The combination of these factors ultimately led into the decision to revise the U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation Guidelines in 1997.

The new defense guidelines can be seen as an alternative to the revision of Article IX. Essentially, the Japanese decided to maintain the constitution as it existed, and instead pursue closer defense cooperation with the U.S. to meet many of these threats. Yamaguchi describes the process of drafting the 1997 Defense Guidelines as filling in holes between the original U.S.-Japan defense cooperation and making cooperation more seamless. Prior to the 1997 Defense Guidelines, U.S.-Japan defense cooperation was "like Swiss cheese" and filled with holes and inconsistencies, according to Yamaguchi. Revising the defense cooperation was significantly easier and less politically controversial than revising Article IX. Upgrading the U.S.-Japan alliance had been done once before, but revising the constitution was an unprecedented move.

Even after the 1997 Defense Cooperation Guidelines were drafted, both countries continued to attempt to adjust the relationship to become more egalitarian. The American frustration was highlighted in the 1998 Department of Defense report on the Allied Contributions to the Common Defense, which stated that "Japan's contributions [to the common defense]

remains substantially below its share of ability to contribute…[in view of] the complex legacy of WWII, [Japan's] responsibility sharing has focused more on assuming a substantial share of U.S. stationing costs and less on other aspects, such as active participation in shared regional and global military roles and missions." Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and former Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph Nye produced an October 2000 report to Congress that suggests that America's "special relationship" with the United Kingdom should serve as the model for its relationship with Japan. The report argued that Japan continued to be "central to America's global security strategy." While the report called for the revision of the prohibition of Japan's collective self-defense and greater participation in UN peacekeeping missions, it did not outright suggest a revision of Article IX. Rather, these suggestions kept with the theme of how Article IX was interpreted during the post-Cold War era: policymakers worked around it, and broadened its interpretations, but never went as far as to suggest its revision. Armitage followed up on this report to implement it into actual policy. Armitage himself called the Japanese ambassador to the U.S. to inform him that the U.S. expected Japan to "show the flag" in the 2001 operation to take down the Taliban in Afghanistan and requested Japanese "boots on the ground" in the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq. To an extent, Japan complied with these demands.

By itself, the increased cooperation with the U.S. would have likely failed to garner the support of the Japanese public in significant enough numbers to go about revising Article IX. The attitudes of the Japanese policymakers and public seemed to diverge. Many Japanese felt that the actions of the U.S. differed from their personal beliefs: according to an *Asahi Shinbun* poll, 60 percent of Japanese citizens thought that the invasion and subsequent war in Iraq was

unjustified.[65] However, it should be noted that the Iraq War was divisive among American citizens as well. It was also possible for the Japanese to shoulder more of the burden with the U.S. without revising Article IX. As demonstrated throughout this chapter, the Japanese expanded their legislation and interpretations of the constitution to adjust to the new demands of the U.S.-Japan relationship. The Americans called for greater Japanese participation, but never once demanded a revision of the Japanese constitution. Thus, there was little motive for the Japanese to revise their constitution on the basis of complying with U.S. demands for greater participation.

Conclusion

The minimal demands for constitutional revision during the post-Cold War era would make the push for constitutional revision under Abe all the more interesting. The sudden paradigm shift following the end of the Cold War would make Japan more apt to revise its constitution, yet the subject was rarely addressed. As will be demonstrated in the upcoming chapter, the Abe administration would mark the rare convergence of domestic political situations, the perception of external threats, and a highly nationalistic leader who had been exposed to the idea of constitutional revision since early childhood. These factors would lead to a greater push for constitutional revision in the coming era.

[65] Oros

Chapter 4

Article IX Revision Under Abe Shinzo

Abe Shinzo's tenure as prime minister marked the culmination of decades of domestic politics, international threats, and family legacy. After decades not discussing the topic of revision, the Abe administration sought to revise the constitution and expand the scope of the Self-Defense Forces. Prior to Abe's administration, Japanese leaders had worked around Article IX to address threats. They passed legislation such as the UN Peacekeeping Operations law in 1992, upgraded its alliance with the U.S., and deployed its forces in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Despite these significant developments, Japan never altered nor reinterpreted Article IX to achieve these goals. As Shinichi Kitaoka wrote prior to Abe's administration, an expansion of Japan's military "is indeed going on, but no one is willing to take on the task of changing the legal framework."[66] Yet Japan might have found someone willing to take on the challenge. While many politicians have strayed from discussing Article IX revision for fear of the political risks in doing so, Abe has become progressively bolder in his calls for revision, going farther than any other Japanese politician in history. During Abe's tenure as prime minister from 2006-07, constitutional revision was seriously discussed for the first time since 1960.

[66] Matthews

Born in 1952, the same year that the Occupation ended and the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty was signed, Abe is regarded as Japan's first true "postwar" prime minister. He first succeeded Koizumi in September 2006, and quickly invigorated the spark that brought about a new nationalism and calls for constitutional revision. Abe's first term was cut short by his resignation due to health issues in September 2007, but he recovered and returned to office in September 2012. Despite his short initial stint in office, Abe is now set to become Japan's longest serving prime minister, provided that he stays in office through November 2019.

Abe is regarded as the most nationalistic prime minister in postwar Japanese history. Abe's nationalism has been exemplified by his controversial visit to the infamous Yasukuni Shrine in December 2013 and indications that he believes that Japan has atoned enough for its wartime aggressions towards China and Korea. The Yasukuni Shrine is a particular point of controversy due to its enshrinement of fourteen convicted Class A war criminals. Abe has been a major figure in efforts led by Japanese conservatives to curtail the apologies from the Japanese government for past aggressions, particularly related to the comfort women issue.[67] During World War II, the Japanese military was responsible for recruiting many Chinese and Korean women into sexual slavery for Japanese soldiers. While some postwar Japanese prime ministers have formally apologized and provided repatriations for the victims of this human rights violation, this has been a continuing issue in Japan's foreign relations to this day. In 2007, Abe declared that there was no evidence for the Japanese government's involvement in these acts, and in January 2018, Abe rejected Seoul's call for an apology to the former comfort women. This approach to history and repatriations symbolizes Abe's stalwart nationalism.

---

[67] Smith

Abe appears to be one of the major missing pieces in the question of why constitutional revision did not occur in the years prior to his administration. While the external circumstances facing Japan have not changed drastically from the Koizumi administration to that of Abe, the attitudes towards constitutional revision have changed dramatically. For the first time, politicians and citizens are openly discussing the issue of Article IX revision, and approximately half of the population is thought to support the initiative. This is due in part to the bold leadership of Abe, who has always been bullish on the issue of constitutional revision: no doubt a legacy from his late grandfather, former Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke. As mentioned earlier, Kishi was Japan's prime minister during the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, and ultimately resigned from disgrace. Kishi's attitudes on issues such as revising the constitution and amending U.S.-Japan relations earned him the support of some of Japan's most extreme nationalists but would ultimately lead to his political downfall in 1960. Abe would inherit Kishi's legacy and quickly earn the support and respect of Japan's nationalists.

As stated earlier, the push for constitutional revision is more of a reflection of domestic politics than a realist response to new security threats in the world. As Eugene Matthews writes, "the U.S. should start paying more attention to the dynamics within Japan's domestic political system, which means monitoring the pulse of Japan's citizens."[68] Several factors of domestic politics that have been crucial in bringing about constitutional revision include the individual leadership of Kishi, rising nationalism, and the public perceptions of international security threats.

[68] Matthews

Abe has already reinterpreted the constitution in 2015 to allow for a greater flexibility in the use of the Self-Defense Forces. With his re-election victory in October 2017, Abe is expected to hold a referendum on the constitution within the next two years. This marks a significant shift in the "work-around" approach to Article IX that Japanese politicians took in the 1990s. Whatever the outcome of the actual referendum, the very discussion of Article IX revision marks a pivotal shift in Japanese politics.

What Is Going On Now?

Before looking at the issue of constitutional revision under Abe, it is important to look at the macro-level changes in Japanese foreign policy under Abe. Japan's foreign policy under Abe has been referred to as "active pacifism," in which Japan is actively engaging in initiatives to ensure a peaceful and more secure world. This differs from the "passive pacifism" adopted by previous prime ministers in which Japan for the most part stood on the sidelines of global affairs. Beginning with the establishment of the Japanese version of the National Security Council in December 2013, the second Abe administration has pursued several institutional modifications towards a more active role in global affairs and politics. The establishment of the Japanese NSC was quickly followed by another bold move: the lifting of the bans on arms exports to countries other than the U.S. The Abe administration handled this with tremendous political savvy in an attempt to counter domestic opposition: the word "arms" was replaced with "defense equipment," and the policy was marketed as a means to ensure stronger ties with allies such as the United Kingdom, France, Australia, and the ASEAN nations.[69]

[69] Nakanishi, Weymouth

Abe has also expanded the scope of Japanese diplomacy and reached out to partners beyond the U.S. Compared to his predecessors, Abe has proved himself to be quite the statesman.While the U.S. had been Japan's main ally during most of its postwar history, Abe's administration saw Japan venturing out to forge closer alliances with other nations. From 2013 to 2016, Abe made a record of 40 trips abroad.[70] Abe has expanded ties to Australia, India, and Southeast Asia. Abe also expanded ties to Europe, formalizing Japan's ties to NATO in 2014 and deepening military equipment cooperation and transfer agreements with the United Kingdom and France. Abe seeks to create a network of democracies within the Asia-Pacific region, positioning Japan as the "anti-China" in the region.[71]

While these developments are not in violation of Article IX, they represent the new foreign policy outlook under Abe and the overall context of events in which Article IX revision is occurring. Abe's diplomacy is also critical in ensuring that a revision of Article IX does not upset the international community. By pursuing non-military means to achieve his goals on the world stage, Abe is able to re-emphasize the point that Japan will never again engage in offensive war and demonstrates that Japan is seeking a peaceful – but more active – role on the world stage.[72]

[70] Auslin, "Getting it Right"
[71] Auslin 1
[72] Auslin, "Getting it Right"

The Importance of Individual Leadership

Abe has explicitly stated that revision of Article IX is his ultimate goal. In his first cabinet from 2006 to 2007, Abe commissioned a panel of experts to review the legal basis for a reinterpretation of Article IX. Abe's ultimate goal is to transform Japan into a "normal power," meaning that Japan has a military power commensurate with its considerable economic strength. Abe has been open about this goal since his early days in politics: at a May 2000 Diet Committee on the Constitution meeting, Abe, then a second-term Lower Member, stated that, "it is clear to everyone that the Constitution was drawn up under significant compulsion." However, Abe has only been able to truly focus on constitutional revision during his last few years in office. He spent many of his first years in office focused on more immediate concerns such as Japan's stagnating economy. Now in his sixth year in office, Abe's focus has shifted towards constitutional revision.

Abe's drive to revise the constitution draws not only from ideological values but also from personal sentiment as the grandson of former Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke. Abe wrote that as a child, people would call his grandfather a war criminal, causing Abe to feel "strong repulsion." He continues that because of this, he became emotionally attached to conservatism.

Yet compared to Abe, the Japanese public are surprisingly apathetic on the issue of revision. Exit polling at the 2017 election revealed that most Japanese voters were indifferent to Abe's aim of revising the constitution or rethinking Japan's postwar identity.[73]

[73] Bosack

Abe sits on the lap of his grandfather, Prime Minister Kishi.

As Penney and Wakefield write, "despite increasing interest overseas in Japan's moves toward constitutional revision, the Japanese public considers the issue a low priority. Respondents to polls are more focused on other issues such as corruption in politics and Japan's crumbling pension system."[74] Furthermore, at the outset of Abe's administration, most of the public held the constitution in high esteem. In 2007, 86.5 percent of the Japanese public thought that the postwar constitution had "brought about economic development through lasting peace."[75] Furthermore, data indicated that younger generations were more likely to support maintaining rather than revising the constitution.[76] A 2007 *Asahi Shinbun* poll highlighted these attitudes, stating that support for constitutional revision had decreased more sharply that year than it had

[74] Penney and Wakefield
[75] Penney and Wakefield
[76] Penney and Wakefield

previously.[77] Based on this data, the views of Abe and the public on constitutional revision had clearly begun to diverge. This makes the importance of individual leadership critical in the quest towards constitutional revision. While constitutional revision was brought about in large part by a major shift in the domestic politics of Japan, it did not come from a major shift in public opinion. As will be demonstrated later in this chapter, Abe would face significant political controversy in his quest to revise the constitution, but this challenge would not stop him. His leadership has been essential in bringing constitutional revision to the point of a referendum.

Changes Under Abe

In many regards, Abe has followed the trends of security and defense reforms begun by politicians during the 1990s.[78] Abe has expanded the scope of the Self-Defense Forces and increased defense spending without an outright revision of the constitution. However, the politicians of the 1990s did not express an outright interest in reinterpreting or revising Article IX like Abe has.

Abe's shift towards constitutional revision occurred gradually over the course of his administration. During his first term as prime minister, Abe skirted around the issue of constitutional revision without proposing a revision. At the time, he was more focused on implementing his "Abenomics" economic reforms. However, Abe expressed a quiet interest in revision. In his first cabinet from 2006 to 2007, Abe commissioned a panel of experts to examine

[77] Penney and Wakefield
[78] Nakanishi

the legal basis for a reinterpretation of Article IX.[79] Citing health issues, Abe resigned in 2007. However, Abe returned six years later to restore the LDP to power after several years under the floundering leadership of the Democratic Party of Japan. When he arrived back as prime minister in 2013, Abe immediately placed defense and security reforms at the top of his agenda, with constitutional revision as a priority issue. Abe's first official act was to approve a new national security council modeled after that of the U.S. to enable closer defense cooperation across the Japanese bureaucracy. Beginning in 2014, Abe gradually increased the military budget by three percent each year. Abe also subsequently planned to expand the scope of the military, pledging to place up to 550 troops on Amami Oshina, the largest island between Kyushu and Okinawa on the Senkaku Island chain. This placement of troops is critical in addressing the conflict with China over the disputed Senkaku (or Diaoyu) Islands, a chain of inhabited islands that both China and Japan have claimed as part of their territory.

Through this process, Abe has gradually moved towards addressing Article IX revision. However, before organizing a referendum on revision, Abe would first bring about one of Japan's most politically controversial legislations since 1960: collective self-defense.

Abe's Greatest Transformation: Collective Self-Defense

One of Abe's most impactful – and controversial – initiatives has been the passage of collective self-defense. Collective self-defense is the idea that Japan can come to the defense of its allies should they be attacked and this use of force not be considered a violation of Article IX. For example, if the U.S. or South Korea were attacked, Japan could deploy its forces to come to

[79] Nakanishi

their aid. This reinterpretation was approved by the Diet in September 2015 when they passed two new pieces of legislation to expand the interpretation of Article IX.

Collective self-defense sparked extreme controversy among both legislators in the Diet and the public at large. The main argument opposing the bills was that the wording of the bills was ambiguous, which allowed the government to stretch the interpretation to a variety of extreme situations. The other argument was that collective self-defense did not simply reinterpret Article IX, but rather it completely violated the constitution.

These arguments against collective self-defense led to an intense debate over the new interpretation. Within the Diet, legislators spent over 200 hours arguing over the bills, the longest such deliberation in the postwar era. Meanwhile, opinion polls in the media demonstrated the polarizing nature of collective self-defense. According to the *Japan Times*, approximately 60 percent of voters opposed collective self-defense bills, and 80 percent stated that the government has yet to provide a sufficient reason as to why they are needed. A mere 31 percent of the Japanese public approved of collective self-defense.[80]

The debate over collective self-defense bore a tremendous similarity to the controversy surrounding the revised U.S.-Japan Security Treaty in 1960. In the days leading up to the passage of the collective self-defense bills, thousands of protesters braved pouring rain and gathered in front of the Diet building in Tokyo to oppose the new security legislation. The most striking example to the new interpretation of the constitution occurred in June 2014, when a lone protester set himself on fire near the Shinjuku train station in Tokyo to oppose the government's new legislation of collective self-defense.

---

[80] Nakanishi

Much of the opposition and controversy surrounding collective self-defense comes from the government's failure to properly explain the reasons for the new legislation. Despite this, Abe remains confident that the public will eventually gravitate towards his point of view. In an address to the Upper House in September 2015, Abe said that "as time passes, (support) will no doubt spread among the public." Abe bears a similar attitude when it comes to the issue of revising Article IX: rather than wait for overwhelming public approval, Abe takes the politically risky path to accomplish what he believes is best for Japan.

Abe has provided various vague reasons for the need to pass collective self-defense ranging from securing oil resources in Iran to the North Korean nuclear threat. Abe has alluded to, though not explicitly stated, that the rise of China's military power in the region also contributed to the need to pass collective self-defense. Another significant reason for Japan's push for collective self-defense was Japan's desire to cooperate more closely with the U.S. on military issues. Many, including Abe, argued that the U.S.-Japan alliance would be weakened had Japan not passed collective self-defense. Statements from President Donald Trump, such as his statement that the U.S. is required to come to the defense of Japan while the Japanese "can sit at home and watch Sony television" undoubtedly contribute to the Japanese fear that they need to increase their contributions to the alliance to appease the U.S. leadership. While the Diet was deliberating the passage of collective self-defense, the U.S. government openly supported the passage of collective self-defense and a reinterpretation of Article IX. The U.S. State Department issued a statement during the debates stating that it "welcomed Japan's ongoing efforts to strengthen the alliance and play a more active role in regional and international security activities, as reflected in Japan's new security legislation." A bipartisan report from the Senate's

Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committee stated that the legislation "will contribute to international peace and security while strengthening the vital alliance between our two countries." While no one in the U.S. dared to touch Article IX, the government did begin to accept the collective self-defense legislation. However, this American acceptance came only after the Japanese were fairly far along in their debates on the matter. While the Americans benefited from the new collective self-defense legislation, they played no role in bringing this about – it was strictly the process of internal Japanese politics.

Abe was successful in his quest to pass collective self-defense, but this was in no means a political victory for him. The legislation was controversial, heavily contested, and divided the Japanese people. The widespread opposition and rare demonstrations against the bill were a political blunder for Abe. As the *Japan Times* writes, "Abe's failure to win the support of the nation represents what some call to be one of the worst political blunders in the postwar period." Yet despite this blunder, Abe continued on in his goal of revising Article IX, demonstrating the relentless and fearless leadership that would sometimes ignore public opinion to accomplish his goals.

The Impact of External Threats

To a degree, external threats play a role in the push to revise the constitution. Yet while external threats such as China and North Korea have undoubtedly influenced Abe's desire to revise the constitution and pushed public opinion in his favor, these issues are not as significant in revising the constitution as an idle observer might suspect. These external threats have existed long before the issue of constitutional revision was addressed. While these issues play a role in

constitutional revision and certainly alter public opinion surrounding Article IX revision, they did not bring about constitutional revision by themselves.

The main threats in this time were the North Korean nuclear program and the rise of China. The Japanese military has expanded its response to these issues, though its responses recently have not been radically different from its responses in the 1990s when it would expand the scope of its military while still working around the terms of Article IX. Furthermore, Japan is not prohibited from defending itself in the event of an attack from a foreign aggressor. As seen in the 2001 response to attack from a North Korean spy ship, the Japanese still retain the right to defend themselves with military force should they be attacked first. The defense of Japan in the event of an attack from North Korea has never been an issue for Article IX revision, because Japan is permitted to defend itself under the present constitution. Furthermore, it is unlikely that Japan would amend Article IX to launch an offensive invasion against North Korea. Even countries with unrestricted militaries like the U.S. and South Korea refuse to invade North Korea, knowing full well that it would be costly, dangerous, and the cost would likely outweigh the benefits. Thus, revising Article IX is not about addressing the North Korea threat. North Korea may alter public opinion in favor of revision, but it did not bring about the debate over revising the constitution.

Though their opinion is not in the mainstream and presents some issues, some experts in Japan doubt the viability of a threat from North Korea. Some experts such as Narushige Michishita, a professor at the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies in Tokyo and former adviser to the Japanese government, believe that North Korea does not pose a significant threat to Japan's security. Michishita instead argues that "the nuclear defense is not about the defense

of Japan, it is about the defense of South Korea," adding that "we're not super concerned." Furthermore, he argues that Japan should not acquire nuclear weapons, stating that "nuclear weapons would weaken, rather than strengthen, the U.S.-Japan alliance," and stating more bluntly, Japan pursuing nuclear weapons "would be a stupid idea." Michishita's views in Japan are particularly pervasive in Japan, where nuclear weapons and even nuclear energy programs face significant stigma from the public. Amending Article IX and acquiring nuclear weapons are two different political tasks, and a revision of Article IX would not likely impact the presence of nuclear weapons in Japan.

While some in Japan obviously view North Korea as a pressing threat to Japan's security, particularly with missile launches over the Japanese mainland, the debate over constitutional revision does not directly relate to the North Korean threat, because the current constitution does not prohibit Japan from defending itself in the event of an attack by North Korea.

The other major threat facing Japan under Abe has been the rise of China. According to polls, China's military modernization is the biggest foreign policy concern of the Japanese public, with 60.5 percent of those surveyed expressing concerns.[81] This is significantly higher than the proportion of the population concerned about the North Korean nuclear threat and the spread of global terrorism and groups such as the Islamic State. Abe inherited a volatile relationship with China at the beginning of his term, but has addressed the China threat while adhering to the scope of Article IX.

The greatest threat in Sino-Japanese relations has been the territorial dispute over the Senkaku (Diaoyu) Islands, a chain of uninhabited islands between Okinawa and Taiwan.

---

[81] Nakanishi

Tensions over the islands increased after Abe's predecessor, Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda, nationalized the three islands in the Senkaku Island chain in 2012 by purchasing the islands from a private owner. However, China believes that the islands were stolen from them. The tensions came close to an outbreak of war when a Japanese Coast Guard Ship collided with a Chinese fishing vessel and the Chinese ship captain was subsequently detained. The affair resulted in a diplomatic scandal for Japan and further deterioration of Sino-Japanese relations. However, this incident represents another instance of how Japan continued to work around Article IX to address these threats. The Japanese Coast Guard do not technically fall under the scope of Article IX, and therefore have more flexibility to use force in areas such as the Senkaku Islands.[82] The Japanese Coast Guard have become somewhat of a quasi-navy to work around the terms of Article IX. Technically a civilian agency, the JCG are exempt from the restrictions of Article IX. The use of the JCG in the Senkaku Island dispute represents how in some regards, Abe has continued to work around Article IX in addressing international threats such as China's military rise. In addition to the use of the JCG rather than the SDF, Abe has used several other measures to address the threat without violating Article IX. Abe has ensured the U.S. commitment to Japan's defense on the issue. In 2014, the Obama administration reaffirmed its commitment to the 1960 U.S.-Japan Security Treaty that requires the U.S. to come to the aid of Japan in the event of an attack. These demonstrate strategies for addressing the China threat and the Senkaku Islands dispute that do not require a revision of Article IX. This continued practice of working around Article IX to address threats indicates that the threat from China is not a driving factor behind constitutional revision in and of itself. If Abe wanted to expand forces to address the

[82] Samuels

China situation, he could avoid a controversial and politically risky strategy of revising Article IX by simply expanding the scope and resources allocated to the JCG. Addressing China simply does not add up as a viable reason as to why constitutional revision is necessary.

Constitutional revision remained a taboo subject for many years after North Korea first became a threat, and only became mainstream well after North Korea and China had established themselves as a threat to Japan. Abe and Kishi both expressed a desire to revise the constitution far earlier than the emergence of China and North Korea as viable threats. As mentioned in earlier chapters, Kishi elaborated his desire to revise the constitution as early as the 1950s and expressed his distaste for the constitution in his 1983 autobiography. Abe has expressed that many of his views were influenced by his grandfather, including the desire to revise the constitution.

While the new threats in the Abe administration have certainly shaped the discourse and public opinion surrounding Article IX, they did not bring about the discussion over Article IX. Rather, Article IX is the result of domestic political processes, not responses to international threats. While adapting to the threats of North Korea and China have a miniscule impact on the revision debate, these factors pale in comparison to the impact of individual leadership, nationalism, and other domestic factors in Japan.

Rising Nationalism

Many observers attribute the drive to revise the constitution to the levels of rising nationalism in Japan. In a June 23, 2007 video short attached to a *New York Times* article, a commentator noted that “Japan is asserting itself militarily. It is embracing right-wing

nationalism. It is denying wartime atrocities. It is flirting with nuclear weapons." Nationalism is notoriously difficult to define,[83] but can generally be referred to as a mood or aspiration in which Japan wants to see itself as a powerful and sovereign nation. It is important to note that while nationalism and militarism can be associated with one another, they do not always coexist. In many cases, nationalism can be associated with group identity, civic values, and a tactic used to mobilize people politically. Some scholars including Shimada Masahiko describe nationalism as not strictly a right-wing, militarist phenomenon, but also as relating to ideas of pacifism. Masahiko writes that "pacifism is no less nationalistic than the right-wing glorification of state power." Regardless, right-wing nationalism continues to bear a taboo in Japan. While only a small number of Japanese citizens subscribe to the ultra-nationalist, revisionist views of the ultra-right wing, many, particularly those in the LDP establishment, are beginning to express their nationalistic desires to see Japan in a more preeminent global role. These supporters do not wish to see Japan return to the ultra-militarist stances that it embodied during World War II, but rather through prominent roles in the existing institutional order, such as a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. They argue that, as one of the largest contributors to the UN, it is time to unshackle the constraints of history and allow Japan to re-emerge as a global power in all regards. While this nationalism does not generally go as far as to call for remilitarization or to present the radical, revisionist history that is exhibited in the Yasukuni Shrine, it does call for realistic changes to Japanese foreign policy: fewer apologies for past aggressions against other countries, a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, and greater independence from the U.S.-Japan security relationship. This rising nationalism also carries over in the push for

[83] Penney and Wakefield

constitutional revision. Part of the rising nationalism can also be reflected in the rituals and institutions of Japan. For example, the Japanese national anthem is now more frequently played in schools.

The more extreme nationalist views within the elites has been brewing for some time. As early as 1995, Ishihara, well known as a more moderate politician, left the LDP precisely because his more moderate colleagues in the LDP did not support his stances, and he felt that the party was on the path to slowly shift towards nationalism. This nationalism increased under Koizumi and truly came into form under Abe.

Nationalism plays a major role in the push for constitutional revision. For decades, Japan's most extreme nationalists have paid particular attention to the issue of Article IX revision. Article IX represents Japan's humiliation at the end of World War II, a deference to American foreign policy, and Japan's limited power on the world stage: all of which make nationalists furious. It is no coincidence that Abe, the most nationalistic prime minister in postwar Japanese history, has made Article IX revision one of his priority issues. While domestic political processes have brought about Article IX revision and made it a normalized subject in Japanese politics, it has long been associated with the ideologies of extreme nationalism in Japan.

U.S.-Japan Relations Under Abe

U.S.-Japan relations also play a role in the recent push to revise the constitution. However, many of the threats presented to the U.S.-Japan alliance have been addressed by

expanding the scope of Article IX and working around it rather than outright revision. U.S. commentary has been remarkably absent from the Japanese debate over Article IX.

Presently, cooperation between the U.S. and Japan is strong. While Abe's predecessor, Prime Minister Hatoyama Yukio, sought to distance himself from the U.S., Abe's administration has focused on deepening the ties between Japan and America.[84] As Abe sought closer ties with the U.S., the Obama administration was strengthening its relationship with Japan as part of its "pivot" to Asia and lessened emphasis on Europe and the Middle East. For the past decade, polls consistently demonstrated that 72 percent of Japanese viewed the U.S. favorably, while 80 percent of Americans considered Japan to be a trusted ally.[85] Furthermore, Japan and the U.S. have made significant steps under Obama and Abe to ease historical tensions. In May 2016, President Obama made a historic visit to Hiroshima, which was reciprocated by Abe's visit to Pearl Harbor in December of that year. The tensions of the 1950s that motivated many Japanese to call for the abandonment of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and Article IX were surprisingly non-existent during the Abe administration.

One of the major shifts in U.S.-Japan relations was the upgraded 2015 Defense Cooperation Guidelines. Up to this point, the U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines had only been published twice, in 1978 and 1997. According to Michael Bosack, a former U.S. Air Force member that helped draft the new guidelines, the 2015 guidelines were "a completion of the 1997 guidelines."[86] Bosack notes that while the 1997 guidelines expanded the scope of the Japanese military, there were still too many gaps in the guidelines, particularly when it came to responding to disasters such as the March 11, 2011 Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster.

---

[84] Auslin - "Getting It Right"
[85] George Packard
[86] Bosack

The threat of the North Korean missile program has called for greater U.S.-Japan defense cooperation.

After the 3/11 disaster, the U.S.-Japan alliance could not be immediately invoked, because this was not considered an act of warfare and defense. Bosack argues that this hindered the relief efforts, because legislators spent too much time debating the role of the troops in the context of Article IX and the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty rather than quickly responding to the disaster.

U.S.-Japan cooperation undertook a major transformation when Donald Trump was elected as president. Suddenly, anti-Japan sentiment had spiked, and many in the U.S. began calling for Japan to cooperate on a more egalitarian basis with the U.S. Trump has accused Japan of repeatedly "killing" the U.S. through unfair practices on trade and has expressed beliefs that Japan is not pulling its weight on defense. Trump's statements brought out anti-Japanese commentators to the mainstream: "Japan is like the 42-year-old kid still living in the basement of

the United States," longtime Asia strategist Keith Henry said to CNN. Many in Japan express anxiety that the U.S. will renege on the U.S.-Japan alliance if Japan continues on its present course. This fear sways public opinion in favor of constitutional revision, as it provides a real, tangible threat to refusing to revise. Abe and several military experts have expressed concern that the U.S.-Japan military alliance would be damaged if Tokyo refused to support the U.S. in the event of an attack against the U.S., and the public is beginning to catch onto these attitudes.

While U.S. has not directly called for a revision of the constitution, it has certainly stoked Japanese public opinion in favor of constitutional revision, because the possible consequences for not revising the constitution and shouldering more of the burden with the U.S. have been heightened under the Trump administration.

While public attitudes in Japan seem to look down at Trump, Abe and Trump have forged

Despite Trump's rhetoric, Abe and Trump have forged a close working relationship. Note the caption on the hats -- "Donald - Shinzo - Make Alliance Even Greater"

a close working relationship. Abe has spoken with Trump more times in the first year of Trump's presidency than he spoke with Obama during the four years while both were in office. Part of this is due to a shift in global conflicts at the time. Despite the "Asia Pivot" during the Obama administration, much of its attention went to fighting global terrorism and conflicts in areas like Syria and the Crimean Peninsula. While the Obama administration declared its greatest threats to be the spread of global terrorism, the Trump administration has declared its foreign policy priorities to be "revisionist powers such as Russia and China." This shift brings U.S. foreign policy priorities more in line with the interests of Japan. However, whether the Trump administration will follow its rhetoric is undetermined.

Despite the leadership of Trump, many Japanese continue to see value in the relationship with the U.S. military. According to Bosack, "it will be hard to justify constitutional amendment if people see value in the U.S. military." But this view may change soon, opening the door for further popular support of constitutional revision. As recently as early 2018, an incident occurred on the island of Okinawa in which the window from a U.S. military helicopter fell onto a schoolyard. Although no one was injured, it sparked discussion among the Japanese about the frustrations and liabilities of having the U.S. on the island. In addition to the helicopter incident, a series of continued "emergency landings" by U.S. helicopters on the beaches of Okinawa have stretched the patience of locals and led some to demand that the U.S. forces leave. Presently, the governor of Okinawa Prefecture also harbors negative views about the presence of U.S. forces on the island. The governor and many opponents of the U.S. bases on the island argue that there were no Okinawans represented in the Diet when the treaty was signed with the U.S. in 1951. Okinawa is already a sensitive issue among the Japanese, but the recent incidents have pulled the

locals further from the U.S., despite the return of much of the land to the locals. With these negative attitudes towards the U.S. bases growing stronger, the Japanese are moving more towards a view that supports constitutional revision and further independence from the U.S.

Constitutional Revision: Not Just Article IX

The relatively antiquated nature of the constitution plays another important role in the push for its revision. The Japanese constitution differs greatly from the constitutions of other nations in that it is notably short, vague, and has not been amended since its inception. As of this writing, the Japanese constitution is the oldest unamended constitution in the world. By contrast, the constitutions of India and Germany, written in 1949 and 1950, respectively, have both been amended over 50 times. The Republic of Korea's constitution has been almost completely rewritten six times since its inception in 1948. Unamended constitutions typically have shorter lifespans than their amended counterparts,[87] and LDP legislators frequently frame Article IX revision as a necessary step to ensure the survival of the constitution into the twenty-first century and as a normal political event.

Article IX revision is just one component of a larger strategy to revise several areas of the constitution. The current LDP government hopes to add provisions to the constitution that provide for state-funded preschool and higher education, expand the powers of the government in the event of an emergency such as the March 2011 Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster, and add new provisions to Article IX. All three of these new initiatives would address the atypical vagueness of the Japanese constitution compared to the constitutions of other nations. The

[87] McElwain

present initiative to revise Article IX centers around the push to add a third clause to the article specifying the role and status of the Self-Defense Forces.

Part of the reason why Article IX revision is feasible at this point is because the revision itself is fairly tame. Rather than completely revoking Article IX or removing restrictions on the military forces, Abe's proposed revision plans to codify the role of the SDF in the constitution itself. Though these changes are small and seemingly irrelevant, Abe hopes that by introducing this legislation he can slowly chip away at the status quo of Article IX. By codifying the SDF in the constitution, Abe sets the precedent for future revision that changes Article IX even further.[88]

A Rare Opportunity for Revision

Part of the push behind constitutional revision in recent years comes from the unique situation that legislators find themselves in today. The referendum on the constitution will need to happen quickly in order for Abe to be successful. The unofficial deadline for constitutional revision is the abdication of Emperor Akihito, which is expected to take place during Japan's "Golden Week" in May 2019. Once Akihito resigns, he will be free to voice his opinions on political issues, including constitutional revision. Many believe that Akihito does not share Abe's views and will voice his opinions in favor of the status quo.[89] Should Akihito make a public statement that even suggests the disapproval of constitutional revision, it is highly unlikely that Abe would be able to secure a public majority of his referendum. The public holds the emperor in high esteem, and to go against the wishes of the emperor would be an unspeakable and disloyal act.

---

[88] Bosack
[89] Bosack

The current makeup of the Diet also provides Abe with a unique opportunity to revise the Constitution. To initiate a referendum through the public, the issue would need a two-thirds majority vote in the Diet. Presently, Abe's party, the Liberal Democratic Party, or LDP, holds a rare two-thirds majority in the Diet, which is not expected to last forever. Public opinion for Abe and the LDP is dropping quickly, with public support for the LDP standing at a mere 30 percent in recent polls. While Abe maintained enough public support to maintain an LDP supermajority in the election, he will likely not be able to sustain the public opinion in his favor long enough to push through a successful referendum on the constitution if he waits any longer.

However, it is not clear whether Abe will garner the public opinion necessary to revise the constitution. While many perceive Abe's October 2017 re-election to be a public approval of his desire to revise the constitution, voters re-elected Abe for his stances on a myriad of issues such as his economic restructuring plan ("Abenomics") and not simply constitutional revision. While Abe won by a landslide in the re-election, public opinion data indicates that the public is split on the issue of constitutional revision.[90] Even though constitutional revision is more likely today than it has been in the past, it will still be a challenging and politically risky topic for Abe.

While the odds are not entirely in Abe's favor, this is Abe's only real chance at revising the constitution in the foreseeable future. A brief window of opportunity has opened that will close in less than two years. The rare combination of situational factors ranging from public support to an LDP majority to imperial abdication created a rare occurrence in which constitutional revision will be difficult, but possible. If Abe hopes to revise the constitution, he

[90] Bosack

must act now or never. It is a gamble, but the odds are better for Abe if he acts now instead of waiting and attempting to earn more public support in favor of his initiatives.

Conclusion

From the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis until the Abe administration, politicians made a point to work around Article IX rather than address the issue of revision head-on. Under Abe, revision became a normalized and increasingly viable prospect. A gamut of factors have emerged in recent years to make constitutional revision mainstream political debate. At the core of these factors is Abe's dogged leadership on the issue. Since his early days in politics, Abe has remained steadfast in his beliefs supporting constitutional revision. Yet while it is difficult to imagine any other politician being as successful as Abe in bringing constitutional revision back into the mainstream, a combination of other factors such as the public perception of external threats and favorable yet extremely rare conditions in domestic politics have made constitutional revision a normalized discussion in Japanese politics. Another important factor to consider in the equation is the rise of nationalism under Koizumi that truly spiked under Abe. This rising nationalism has brought about a desire for constitutional revision and the need to see Japan re-emerge as a leading power on the world stage in both politics and economics.

Conclusion:

What Next?

Following Abe's landslide victory in the October 2017 re-election, a referendum on revising the constitution is all but guaranteed within the next two years. A referendum on a previously taboo subject marks a striking departure from the discourse of the past. Whether this referendum will pass, however, is a different subject altogether. The public remains heavily divided on the issue of Article IX revision. But how will a possible revision of Article IX come about, and what will it mean for Japanese defense policy moving forward?

The referendum in and of itself will not bring about major changes to Japanese defense policy. The predicted revision would simply add a third clause codifying the role of the Self-Defense Forces within the context of Article IX. However, this revision would be significant – and controversial – because a successful referendum would pave the way for further revision that would loosen the restrictions on the Self-Defense Forces.[91]

The only certainty in Article IX's future is that it will be subject to heavy debate prior to the referendum. Contrary to its taboo nature from 1960 until 2007, politicians and the general public will heavily debate the issue of constitutional revision in the months leading up to the referendum. While the outcome of this debate is uncertain, the very existence of these debates represents a major shift in Japanese politics. Wherever this debate will go, the path that it will take will certainly be fascinating.

---

[91] Bosack

Expected Paths

A referendum on the constitution will need to happen soon if it is to have any chance of passing. The unofficial deadline for a constitutional referendum in Emperor Akihito's abdication during "Golden Week" in May 2019. Holding the referendum after Akihito's resignation is extremely risky for Abe because once Akihito abdicates, he will be free to voice his opinions on a number of political issues. Experts predict that Akihito will oppose constitutional revision.[92] The Japanese public holds the emperor in high reverence, and voting against the wishes of the emperor in a referendum would be considered to be extremely disrespectful.

Presently, it is not clear which side would win in a referendum on Article IX. The public is almost evenly divided on the issue, and the many debates and heavy media coverage on Article IX are expected to draw extraordinarily high voter turnout in the referendum. Additionally, since the referendum would cover constitutional issues such as early childhood education, the election would draw out voters who were less invested in the issue of Article IX revision.

Based on public opinion data, revising the constitution will be a difficult endeavor for Abe. According to the Council on Foreign Relations, in all three major newspaper polls on constitutional revision in 2016, fifty percent or more of those polled opposed constitutional revision.[93] A March 2016 *Yomiuri Shinbun* poll best captures the divisive nature of constitutional revision: 49 percent of respondents supported revision, while 50 percent opposed it. The responses to Abe's push to revise the constitution tell an interesting story. While Abe has made constitutional revision a priority agenda item in his administration, the Japanese public are

[92] Bosack
[93] Council on Foreign Relations, 2016

hesitant to support revision under Abe specifically. According to a July 14, 2016 *Asahi Shinbun* poll, only 35 percent of respondents favored constitutional revision under Abe. The divergence of support for constitutional revision and support for Abe's constitutional revision indicates that perhaps Abe's more nationalistic and ideological bases for revising the constitution leave a negative opinion in the eyes of many Japanese. If that is the case, then why is the Japanese public supporting constitutional revision?

According to polling data, the majority of respondents seem to support constitutional revision as a means to incorporate new norms and guidelines for the SDF. According to a 2012 survey from the *Asahi Shinbun*, 69 percent of respondents favored constitutional revision for "new rights and rules to be included." Meanwhile, only 17 percent supported revision because "Article IX has problems," and a mere 9 percent supported revision because "the Japanese

should write their own constitution."[94] For all of the nationalistic discussion of Article IX revision as a means of righting the wrongs of the American Occupation or returning Japan to a place of glory on the world stage, these ideologies seem to elude the majority of the Japanese public. To average voters, revising Article IX is much more about practical concerns. Nearly half of those supporting a revision state that they endorse the revision simply because the current constitution is simply too old, and another 40 percent argue for a revision because "there are problems with the current legislative system."[95] While nationalism and ideological bases certainly drive legislators like Abe, for the most part, the general public does not share these sentiments. The transition of nationalism and support for Article IX revision emerging from taboo into the mainstream discourse is a phenomenon that has trickled down from the highest levels of government into the general public rather than the other way around. Essentially, it has been a elite-driven process based predominantly in domestic politics.

American Responses

So, what should the U.S. do about Article IX revision? Nothing.

The best action for the U.S. to take is to let the constitutional debate in Japan run its course without meddling. Japan is one of America's closest allies, and the partnership will respond accordingly to whatever changes occur in Japan's domestic politics. Whatever Japan decides will have an important impact on U.S. policy in the Asia-Pacific region and around the world, but for now, it is important to let the Japanese voters, not U.S. interests, determine the future of Article IX and Japanese defense policy.

---

[94] Council on Foreign Relations
[95] 2014, 2016 Asahi Shinbun poll on the Council for Foreign Relations

The codification of the SDF in Article IX will admittedly not have a tremendous impact on U.S.-Japan defense cooperation. Yet it should be emphasized that regardless of the outcome of the referendum of Article IX, Japan will still be capable of defending itself if attacked by an adversary. Japan is also not prevented from coming to the aid of the U.S. or another ally should the ally be attacked. While constitutional revision is often touted as a significant step in allowing Japan to defend itself against North Korean attacks, this view is inaccurate. Already, Japan is capable of defending itself, and has been engaging in joint military exercises with the U.S. military forces to deter North Korean aggressions. With the passage of collective self-defense, Japan can also come to the aid of South Korea in the event of their attack. While the North Korean threat plays an important role in influencing public opinion about Article IX revision, it is not responsible for driving revision. Article IX revision is a domestic political phenomena, not a response to the North Korean threat.

Is Constitutional Revision Good For Japan?

Policymakers and pundits in Japan and around the world are debating whether constitutional revision will benefit or harm Japan. There is no clear answer to this question, because there is no precedent for Japanese constitutional revision in history. Realistically, no one quite knows for sure what exactly will happen next should Japan pass the referendum to revise Article IX. The theories posited are educated guesses, but realistically, nobody quite knows for sure where this debate and revision will lead. Without a clear prediction of the endgame for Article IX revision, it is impossible to say whether it will be good or bad for Japan.

Despite the lack of concrete predictions for outcomes of the referendums, one thing is certain. It is unlikely that Japan will become a major military force after revising its constitution. Presently, Japan boasts a modest, but not miniscule, military. Japan is the eighth largest military force in the world in terms of money spent on its military. While Japan spends a minute portion of its GDP on defense, it still spends more money on defense than other nations such as Israel, South Korea, Iran, and Australia.

Public opinion in favor of a constitutional revision and support for an engagement in conflict are two different concepts. While constitutional revision requires merely ideological support, sending Japan's troops away to combat requires personal sacrifice from individual citizens. This is an even greater sacrifice than other nations with ample numbers of young people. Already, Japan is facing a demographic crisis in which its population is aging rapidly. There are simply are not enough young people to fill jobs in the regular economy, let alone to increase the size of the military. Furthermore, asking individual citizens to deploy abroad is significantly more challenging than persuading them to vote for a revision.

For the most part, constitutional revision will not change anything major about the size and scope of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces, but it will mark a major shift in domestic politics. Whether that shift in domestic politics is good or bad has yet to be determined – but it will have a major impact on Japan.

The process of constitutional revision is the story of how an idea became a policy, and the events and individuals that helped make this come to fruition. This is not a story of threats. This is a story of ideas. Article IX revision is about how an idea can pass from a grandfather to a grandson, and how that idea can ultimately influence the course of a nation's politics. At its core,

the study of politics and international relations is the study of ideas, and Japan's odyssey towards constitutional revision has been no exception to this rule.

As for now, the future of Article IX remains uncertain. But the ideas and the dialogue about revision have emerged. The debate over its revision is back in the mainstream, marking a watershed moment in the history of the Japanese constitution. But where will these ideas and dialogue lead? Nobody quite knows. Japan stands on the edge of a new era in its foreign policy. While no one quite knows exactly how it will distinguish itself, the future of Japanese foreign policy will be a marked departure from its past. Only time will tell where these debates and ideas will go.

Works Cited

Masatoshi Asaoka and Ayumi Teraoka, "Japanese Public Opinion on Constitutional Revision in 2016," Council on Foreign Relations blog, 1 August 2016

Michael Auslin, "Japan's New Realism: Abe Gets Tough," *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2016.
Auslin outlines the shift in Japan's foreign policy under Abe and describes the shift from multilateral engagement in organizations like the UN to a more realist perspective. Auslin also describes Japan's expanding diplomatic initiatives.

Axel Bertofsky, "Japan's Post-War Constitution: Origins, Protagonists, and Controversies," *Il Politico,* Vol. 75, No. 2 (224), 2010, pp. 5-25.
Bertofsky describes the chaotic circumstances surrounding the drafting of the Japanese constitution as well as Konoe's record as a war criminal.

Ying Ding, "Distorting history: Shinzo Abe's personal political ambitions endanger the region's stability," *Beijing Review*, 9 January 2014.
This article looks into Abe Shinzo's personal background as the son of Kishi Nobusuke and his personal ambitions to revise the constitution and remilitarize Japan.

John W. Dover, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II,* W. W. Norton and Company, 1999.
This provides a compelling description of the events in the wake of World War II. It also provides a more detailed social history looking at the Japanese people instead of simply the elites. It also provides anecdotes and evidence of the dire poverty and starvation faced by the Japanese people during this time period.

H.D.P. Envall, *Japanese Diplomacy: The Role of Leadership,* SUNY Press, 2015.
Envall describes how Kishi inadvertently strengthened Yoshida's legacy during his attempts to revise the security treaty, and gives an overview of the leadership styles of Kishi and Abe in foreign policy.

"Constitution and Basis of Defense Policy," *Fundamental Concepts of National Defense*, Ministry of Defense, www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/d_policy/dp01.html

Andrew Gordon, *A Modern History of Japan: From the Tokugawa Times to the Present*, Ch. 8-17, Oxford University Press, 2003.

Gordon provides a broader understanding of Japanese history and nationalism before the postwar era. He provides valuable information about Japanese nationalism dating back to the Meiji Restoration of 1868, the historical roots of imperial Japan, and the Russo-Japanese War of 1905.

"The Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Cooperation" (September 27, 1978) www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/anpo/19781127.html

Harry D. Harootunian, "Commentary on Nationalism in Japan: Nationalism as Intellectual History," *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Nov. 1971), pp. 57-62.

Harootunian provides a description of nationalism and attempts to discern where Japanese nationalism comes from.

Dale M. Hellegers, *We, the Japanese People: World War II and the origins of the Japanese Constitution*, Stanford University Press, 2002.

Hellegers provides more information on the Occupation origins of the constitution.

John Hemmings and Maiko Kuroki, "Shinzo Abe: Foreign Policy 2.0," *Harvard Asia Quarterly*, Vol. 15, Issue 1, Spring 2013, p. 8-14.

This article provides an overview of the changes in Japan's foreign policy and security approach during the second prime ministership of Abe (2012-present).

Glenn D. Hook, *Japan's Contested Constitution*

Provides more background on the controversy surrounding Japan's constitution and Article IX

Christopher W. Hughes, "Japan's Military Security Policy," *Japan's Security Agenda: Military, Economic, and Environmental Dimensions*, Lynne Rienner Publications, 2004.

Hughes describes some of the recent developments in Japan's remilitarization.

Okyoko Inoe, *MacArthur's Japanese Constitution*

Provides further background on the history and controversy surrounding Japan's constitution

"Can the Japan-Korea dispute on 'comfort women' be resolved?" Gabriel Jonsson, *Korea Observer*, 46 no. 3 (Fall 2015), p. 489-515.

Henry Kissinger, *World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History,* Penguin Books, 2014, pp. 180-191.

Kissinger gives his perspective on some of the recent developments in Japanese politics and their connection to Japanese history and East Asia as a whole.

Masao Maruyama, "Theory and Psychology of Ultra-Nationalism," *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics,* Ch. 1, Oxford University Press, 1969.

Maruyama is an intellectual historian who describes some of the distinctive aspects of Japanese nationalism and compares it to the nationalism exhibited in other countries. Maruyama also looks into the psychological and sociological roots of nationalism in Japan.

Eugene A. Matthews, "Japan's New Nationalism," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82, No. 6 (Nov. - Dec. 2003), pp. 74-90.

Matthews tracks the origin of nationalism, and introduces Japan's "fear of itself" in terms of remilitarization. Furthermore, it runs through comparisons to the interwar period and today in terms of Japanese nationalism. However, Matthews makes a statement that I disagree with -- he essentially argues that Washington should "control" Japanese nationalism and manipulate it to ensure that dangers and excesses are averted. Is that really possible for Washington to do? They can't even seem to control their own domestic opinion in their country.

Kenneth McElwain and Christian Winkler, "What's Unique About the Japanese Constitution? A Comparative and Historical Analysis," *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 41.2.

Dr. McElwain was one of the professors in Tokyo that I interviewed. In this article, he compares Japan's constitution to that of other industrialized nations and explains its unique features, such as its age and that it has never been amended.

Theodore McNelly, "American Influence and Japan's No-War Constitution," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Dec. 1952), pp. 589-598.

Explains how General MacArthur authored the famous clause in Japan's postwar Constitution in which Japan forever renounces war as a means of settling disputes, as well as how the constitution was adopted. Ended with important quote about how constitutional revision was being discussed and even pushed by MacArthur as early as 1950 that would prove to be an interesting beginning quote.

Theodore McNelly, "The Japanese Constitution: Child of the Cold War," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (Jun. 1959), pp. 176-195.

This essay included the information from Acheson to Byrne about how the American occupying forces were preparing the future possibility of a remilitarized Japan as the Constitution was being drafted, and the peace-provision was a later provision that was

inputted by MacArthur. This also discusses Whitney's threats of indicting the emperor to the Japanese if they did not accept the Constitutional draft. It also discusses the origin of the constitution in the context of its competing rivalry with other constitutional drafts of other nations.

Narushige Michishita, "North Korea's ultimate goal is actually improving relations with US - fmr. Japan govt adviser," *RT*, 28 September 2017.

I interviewed Professor Michishita on some of the subjects discussed in this RT interview. This provides more information about the assertion that I mention in the thesis that Japan does not view North Korea as a major security threat.

David Milne, *Worldmaking: The Art and Science of American Diplomacy*

Milne describes how foreign policy originates from ideas that are transformed into policies.

Hiroshi Nakanishi, "Reorienting Japan? Security transformation under the second Abe cabinet," *Asian Perspective*, 39 no. 3, July-Sept. 2015, p. 405-421.

This article explains how Abe has changed the bureaucracy of national defense in Japan to support remilitarization and a stronger presence. It also discusses how Abe has increased military spending, though kept it at below 1% of the overall GDP of Japan.

Andrew Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, Stanford University Press, 2008.

Oros book provided one of the most authoritative accounts of the relationship between Japanese nationalism and its remilitarization. He examines broad trends in Japanese security policy trends that are incorporated into this thesis.

Ted Osinus, *The U.S.-Japan Security Alliance: Why It Matters and How to Strengthen It,* Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002.

This book describes the new security challenges that Japan faces in the post-Cold War era, including the rise of China, the North Korean nuclear threat, and a more complex US-Japan alliance.

George R. Packard III, "The United States-Japan Security Treaty at 50: Still a Grand Bargain?" *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2010.

Packard's follow-up to his 1966 book on the Security Treaty Crisis. Packard describes new challenges to the Security Treaty and its challenges in the post-Cold War era.

George R. Packard III, *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960,* Princeton University Press, 1966.

Packard gives a historical account of the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis, discussing its origins, the domestic politics and partisan issues affecting the Security Treaty, and Prime Minister Kishi's subsequent resignation. Furthermore, Packard devotes about half a chapter specifically to discussing the role of Japanese nationalism in the 1960 Security Treaty Crisis. This book also provides great insight into understanding the complexity of the US-Japan relationship, and how President Eisenhower's visit to Japan in June 1960 was cancelled due to the protests (no incumbent president traveled to Japan until Gerald Ford).

Matthew Penney and Bryce Wakefield, "Right Angles: Examining Accounts of Japanese Neo-Nationalism," *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 4 (Winter 2008-2009), pp. 537-555.

Provides comparative definitions of nationalism, and information and data about public opinion regarding the issue of revision.

Kenneth Pyle, *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose,* Century Foundation Books, 2008.

This book approached the changes to Japanese foreign policy from a historical perspective. It frequently discussed the role of Japanese nationalism and dates it back to almost a century before the Second World War.

Edwin O. Reischauer, *Japan: The Story of a Nation*, Alfred A. Knopf Publishers, first published 1970, 4th edition published 1990.

Reischauer provides an analysis of Japanese politics, foreign policy, and economic development to the 1980s. As the former US Ambassador to Japan, he prvoides a unique insight into the changes to the foreign policy in the region. However, his analyses that US-Japanese relations under President Kennedy were helpful but also must be taken with a grain of salt since he was Kennedy's ambassador to Japan.

Frances Rosenbluth and Michael F. Thies, *Japan Transformed: Political Change and Economic Restructuring*, Princeton University Press (2010), p. 123-154.

Richard Samuels, "'New fighting power!' Japan's growing maritime capabilities and East Asian security," *International Security*, 32 no. 3 (Win 2007-2008), p. 84-112.

Richard J. Samuels, *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia,* Cornell University Press, 2008.

This book provided an overall look into the changing security nature that Japan faces. Additionally, it introduced the idea of nationalism in Japanese foreign policy and domestic policy debates.

"Abe's dream of amending Constitution slipping away," Linda Sieg, *Japan Times*, 1 August 2017.

This article described how Abe was losing public support, which might have hindered constitutional revision. However, Abe went on to win re-election by a landslide two months after this was written. It also describes how the current makeup of the Japanese Diet and ⅔ majority held by the LDP make this a prime opportunity for revision of the constitution.

Sheila Smith, "The Politics of Leaving the 'Postwar' Behind: Nationalism, Pragmatism, and Japan's Foreign Policy," *Harvard Asia Quarterly,* March 2008.

Smith provides an application of nationalism to the changes in Japanese foreign policy up to the end of Abe's first stint as prime minister.

Koseki Shoichi, *The Birth of Japan's Postwar Constitution,* translated by Ray A. Moore, Westview Press, 1997.

Explains the chronological development of the postwar constitution as a whole, including the secrecy involved in the development of the constitution and how the Japanese people learned of the final draft through the mass media.

"An interview with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe," Lally Weymouth, *The Washington Post*, 7 November 2014.

"Formed in childhood, roots of Abe's conservatism go deep," Reiji Yoshida, *Japan Times*, 26 December 2012.

This article discusses Abe's relationship with his grandfather, Kishi Nobusuke, and how that relationship affects Abe's sense of nationalism and desire to revise the constitution. Kishi was a Class A war criminal who went on to become Prime Minister. As Prime Minister, he sought a more militarily active Japan, and sought to make Japan a more robust power in the renegotiation of the US-Japan Security Treaty of 1960. Sparking public outrage, Kishi resigned after the protests surrounding the revision of the 1960 Security Treaty.

Yoshinobu Yamamoto, *Globalism, Regionalism and Nationalism: Asia in search of its role in the twenty-first century*, Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Xiaoming Zhang, "China's perceptions of and responses to Abe's foreign policy," *Asian Perspective,* 39 no. 3, July-Sept. 2015, p. 423-440.

Zhang describes China's anxiety regarding Abe's remilitarization of Japan and China's frustration with Abe's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine.

"Japan's Abe Addresses U.S. Congress (Full Speech)," *Bloomberg*, 29 April 2015.

"Trump rips U.S. defense of Japan as one-sided, too expensive," *Japan Times*, 6 August 2016.

Interviews:

January 22, 2018: Interview with Kenneth McElwain, Professor at the University of Tokyo

January 24, 2018: Interview with Michael Bosack, Ph.D. Student at the International University of Japan and former Officer of the U.S. Air Force, Japan

January 25, 2018: Interview with Noboru Yamaguchi, Professor at the International University of Japan and former Commander of the Japanese Ground Self-Defense Forces

January 26, 2018: Interview with Narushige Michishita, Professor at the Graduate Institute of Policy Research, Tokyo, Japan

Biography

Olivia Griffin is a student at the University of Texas at Austin pursuing degrees in Plan II Honors, Government, and History. She previously completed internships at the United Nations' Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland and on former Maryland Governor Martin O'Malley's 2016 presidential campaign. During her time at UT, she also studied abroad at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland and wrote for *The Daily Texan*. Her work has been featured in *The Dallas Morning News* and *The Washington Post*. She has received a scholarship to attend Boston University School of Law this fall, where she hopes to specialize in comparative and international law.